DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 821 FL 017 945

TITLE	Bilingual/ESL Education: Program Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Texas Education Agency, Austin.
REPORT NO	RE9-726-03
PUB DATE	Sep 88
NOTE	158p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Distribution Office, Texas Education Agency, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701-1494 ($3.50).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education Programs; Classroom Research; Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Limited English Speaking; Predictor Variables; *Program Design; *Program Effectiveness; Public Schools; Remedial Instruction; *Second Language Programs; State Programs; State Surveys; *Student Characteristics; Student Promotion
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

The statewide overview of Texas bilingual and English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) programs for limited-English-speaking public school students reports results of a survey concerning program and student characteristics and successful instructional practices. Data for bilingual and ESL programs are considered separately. Student characteristics studied include eligibility for free or reduced-price lunches, mobility within and among districts, English reading level, previous schooling, native language use in the classroom, attendance patterns, participation in extracurricular activities, the need for intervention as perceived by staff, and the students' success or perceived success in the program. Exit and promotion rates and the need for remedial instruction are also examined. Instructional program data investigated include campus instructional strategies, percentages of students enrolled in other compensatory programs, use of reduced- or modified-content classes, class size, teacher language use in the classroom, and student promotion and success. Other variables examined include teacher qualifications and experience, parent involvement, student performance on objective measures, student achievement gains, and actual or perceived success. Appended materials include the questionnaire, coding information, evaluation requirements, and a brief comparison of the bilingual and ESL studies. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305821

PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

BILINGUAL/ESL EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kemp, L.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas

FL017945

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

(State Board for Vocational Education)

JON BRUMLEY, Fort Worth
Chairman of the State Board of Education
District 11

REBECCA CANNING, Waco
Vice Chairman of the State Board of Education
District 9

EMMETT J. CONRAD, Dallas
Secretary of the State Board of Education
District 13

Board Members

VOLLY C. BASTINE, JR., Houston
District 4

MARY HELEN BERLANGA, Corpus Christi
District 2

CAROLYN HONEA CRAWFORD, Beaumont
District 7

CHARLES W. DUNCAN, JR., Houston
District 6

PAUL C. DUNN, Levelland
District 15

MARIA ELENA A. FLOOD, El Paso
District 1

WILLIAM V. McBRIDE, San Antonio
District 5

GERALDINE MILLER, Dallas
District 12

PETE MORALES, JR., Devine
District 3

JOHN MACK PRESCOTT, College Station
District 10

KATHERINE PEARCY RAINES, Cleburne
District 14

JACK STRONG, Longview
District 8

W. N. KIRBY, Commissioner of Education
(Executive Officer of the State Board of Education)

Committees
of the
State Board of Education

Personnel
JOHN MACK PRESCOTT, Chairman
REBECCA CANNING
EMMETT J. CONRAD
CAROLYN HONEA CRAWFORD
PAUL C. DUNN

Finance & Programs
MARIA ELENA A. FLOOD, Chairman
JON BRUMLEY
WILLIAM V. McBRIDE
GERALDINE MILLER
PETE MORALES, JR.

Long-Range Planning
REBECCA CANNING, Chairman
MARY HELEN BERLANGA
EMMETT J. CONRAD
CAROLYN HONEA CRAWFORD
CHARLES W. DUNCAN, JR.
WILLIAM V. McBRIDE

Students
JACK STRONG, Chairman
VOLLY C. BASTINE, JR.
MARY HELEN BERLANGA
CHARLES W. DUNCAN, JR.
KATHERINE PEARCY RAINES

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the Publications Distribution Office of the Texas Education Agency. The charge for each copy of this report will be $3.50. Address requests to:

Publications Distribution Office
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494
(512) 463-9744

Please refer to the following information when requesting additional copies of this report.

Program Evaluation Report: Bilingual/ESL Education
TEA Publication No. RE9-726-03
September 1988

PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN TEXAS
1986-87

Executive Summary

Early in the history of this country, new immigrants were faced with learning a new land and in many cases, a new language. Many of these newcomers were thrust into a "sink or swim" situation; that is, they were forced to learn English with little or no support. Like new immigrants, children with a native language other than English are often thrust into this same learning situation. In response to these students' need for more effective language learning strategies, many schools employ what is termed as the "bilingual approach." Bilingual education, of course, includes a variety of approaches to language learning, many of which may arguably be included under the umbrella definition of a bilingual approach. This report on bilingual education does not contrast the presence of bilingual education with the absence of a special language program, nor does it formally contrast major approaches within the term bilingual education.

There are approximately 3,200,000 students in Texas public schools; approximately 274,145 of these are students of limited English proficiency (LEP). That is, students whose primary language is other than English and whose English language skills are such that the students have difficulty performing ordinary classwork in English.

Most of the LEP students in Texas come from Spanish-speaking homes (93 percent), although there are significant numbers of students from Vietnamese, Cambodian, Korean, Japanese, French, German, Farsi, Arabic, and Chinese language groups. In this state, districts with 20 or more students of limited English proficiency in one language group are required to provide bilingual education in the elementary grades. LEP students not being served through bilingual education must receive at least one instructional period of English-as-a-second-language (ESL) daily.

This report examines instructional practices and outcomes evidenced in bilingual programs and provides districts with information for examining local programs. As the minority population in Texas increases, the need to have all students prepared to compete in the business world and to be contributing citizens provides a major challenge to the education community. Current attempts to meet this challenge include two basic educational treatment programs as defined in the 1986 Guidelines for Language Usage in Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language Programs. Although there are variations in the implementation of these programs, the two basic programs are: Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) in which the primary language of the student is used as a medium of instruction only until the time that the student masters English; and English as a second language (ESL), which is instruction in English listening, speaking, reading, and language through the use of any one or a combination of methods for teaching English to primary speakers of other languages. Although the teacher is the primary language model,

language is also acquired through peer interaction, the media, and the general environment. These methods are sometimes collectively referred to as "special language programs."

Review of the literature on bilingual education programs indicates several reasons why these programs are difficult to evaluate and why interpretation of results should be approached with caution. Some of the difficulties encountered in evaluating bilingual education programs stem from the diversity of bilingual programs; the disagreements among educators as to the goals of bilingual education, the methods that should be utilized to instruct students, the criteria for determining a student's success or failure (e.g., promotion rates, exit rates, achievement test scores, etc.); disputes regarding appropriate evaluation designs; and continuous modification of programs. Furthermore, there is much disagreement concerning the testing instruments used to assess English proficiency, which is partially a result of the small number of language assessment instruments available.

Approaching the identification of effective practices from both a campus and student level provided a combination of program-level information and student-specific information, allowing comparisons on different levels of information. The technique of using many "vantage points" when viewing the data should be particularly helpful to the wide variety of audiences served by this study.

A primary goal of this phase of the study was the development of a statewide overview of bilingual and ESL programs as currently implemented in Texas. This report does not include descriptions of how these programs could or should be implemented. The goal was neither to differentiate among programs funded by specific state, local, or federal sources nor among individual districts or campuses but rather, to determine the general condition and impact of bilingual education programs in Texas. Another goal of this study was the identification of specific practices associated with successful and nonsuccessful limited English proficient (LEP) students, which is anticipated to be useful in the development of local programs seeking to improve services to students.

Success, or lack of it, historically has been attributed to programs on the basis of student performance on singular outcomes such as test scores, grades, attendance, or drop-out rates. While each of these measures has been espoused in various studies or legally mandated evaluations, in actuality most programs hope to achieve positive changes across a broad spectrum of these outcomes. The term success as used in this study encompasses a variety of outcome measures including achievement test scores, Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) scores, oral language proficiency measures, promotion rates, exit rates, and mastery of essential elements. Because some indices of success may have little to do with objective measures, districts were also given the opportunity to rate students as successful or nonsuccessful according to local standards. Analyses of the contrasts and agreements between objective and subjective measures of success were expected to provide interesting results.

Questionnaires reflecting the two major goals of the study - to provide a general description of bilingual education programs statewide and to identify successful instructional practices - were developed based upon a number of different sources. In general, the questionnaires requested information on program implementation, instructors, students, and student performance. The individual student questionnaire consisted of 77 questions contained in sections covering student background information, performance measures, general and specific program implementation, teacher experience, and parental involvement.

Since the data in this report were not obtained from a strictly controlled experimental research design, attempts to draw inferential conclusions from the data should be undertaken with considerable caution. Relationships based on correlation neither imply nor preclude causal relationships. In addition, averages (means) are presented throughout the report. The reader should be aware that there will be considerable variation from the average in the descriptions and performance indicators of individual districts and campuses. Accordingly, one should take great care in attempting specific interpretations and in making generalizations from these results.

The following brief summaries of the findings of this study are annotated by references to page numbers from the entire report. It is strongly recommended that the reader consult the referenced pages of the report to establish the context from which the findings and conclusions are drawn.

Students

1. According to both campus and individual student data, the percentage of students eligible for the free/reduced price lunch program is approximately 85 percent in bilingual and 80 percent in ESL programs (pages 24, 47, and 48).

2. Eligibility for the free/reduced price lunch program does not appear to be associated with success or lack of success. However, the relationship may not have been evident, since only a small number of students in special language programs are not eligible for the program (pages 48 and 62).

3. Student mobility, either within the district or among districts, does not appear to be related to success or lack of success (page 61).

4. Approximately 61 percent of bilingual students and 67 percent of ESL students are below the English reading level expected for their grade level (page 57).

5. Bilingual students who have been schooled in their native country are more likely to be perceived subjectively successful than students who have not received schooling outside the United States (page 61).

6. Bilingual students who use their native language less frequently in the classroom are more likely to be subjectively perceived successful. In addition, this relationship is evident for ESL students in grades 7 through 12 (pages 63 and 64).

7. As the number of absences decreases, the likelihood of subjectively perceived success increases for all special language students (page 64).

8. Bilingual students in grades 1 through 6 who participate in extracurricular activities are more likely to be identified as successful. However, 78 percent of this group of students does not participate in extracurricular activities (pages 64 and 65).

9. In the opinion of district staff, 3 to 4 percent of bilingual and ESL students are likely to drop-out regardless of support level, while almost 30 percent will need significant intervention. Given the overall drop-out rate for these students of around 35 percent (estimates vary considerably), it might be surmised that the intervention needed may not be available (page 65).

Exit Rates

1. Data for grade levels PK - 6 indicated that an average of approximately 32 percent of ESL students exit the program annually, while approximately 10 percent fewer bilingual students exit the program each year (page 29).

2. The differences between the exit rates are most pronounced for campuses in districts with more than 10,000 ADA and in those with a minority student population of less than 20 percent of the enrollment. In these cases, there is a much lower exit rate from bilingual as compared to ESL programs (page 31).

3. Examination of the percentage of students in various achievement test score ranges indicated that bilingual students are retained in special language programs until higher achievement test scores are attained. This strategy may partially account for differences in exit rates between bilingual and ESL programs (page 41).

Promotion

1. Campus data indicate that bilingual students are promoted at a slightly higher rate than ESL students. Conversely, student data indicate that ESL students are promoted at a slightly higher rate. In general, the differences between promotion, retention, and placement rates are quite small (pages 35 and 57).

2. Retention is significantly related to nonsuccess in both programs. The percentage of students subjectively perceived successful drops dramatically after only one retention (pages 62 and 63).

Need for Remediation

1. Campus data indicate that students exiting ESL programs require less additional compensatory service (such as Chapter 1) than students exiting bilingual programs (pages 38 and 39).

2. As measured by the need for additional remediation, late exit strategies appear to be more effective, particularly for bilingual students. In fact, there is little difference in the amount of additional remediation needed between bilingual and ESL programs exiting students at higher achievement levels (pages 39 and 40).

Instructional Program

1. Campus data indicate little variation among grade levels in the instructional strategies used by ESL programs. However, there are noticeable differences in the strategies used between ESL and bilingual programs. Since campuses employ a number of strategies to meet individual students' needs, it is not possible to link campus strategies to particular promotion or exit rates (page 26).

2. In both programs, the percentage of students also enrolled in another compensatory program (dual service) generally averages approximately 50 percent (pages 26, 27 and 46).

3. Dual service is associated with lower promotion rates and is related to nonsuccess (pages 38, 71, and 72).

4. The use of reduced/modified content classes for bilingual students and for ESL students in grades 7 - 12 is associated with a lack of success. Furthermore, instruction in fewer essential elements for ESL students in grades 1 - 6 is associated with nonsuccess, despite consideration of initially low achievement levels (pages 73 and 78).

5. Bilingual classrooms with 11 to 18 students, as compared to classrooms in other size ranges, appear to be optimal for objective success (page 74).

6. Students of bilingual teachers using the native language less at the beginning of the school year tend to be identified as objectively successful (pages 73 and 74).

Other Variables

1. Campus-level data indicate that bilingual teachers are more experienced, although more ESL teachers have earned advanced degrees. In contrast, more ESL teachers are teaching with special permits or waivers (page 24).

2. The only teacher variable statistically associated with success is specific experience in special language instruction. In particular, bilingual students are less likely to be subjectively

perceived successful as the amount of the bilingual teacher's general experience increases (page 81).

3. Parental involvement in PTA/PTO organizations is significantly related to success. However, it was noted that as the number of parental conferences increases, the student is more likely to be identified as unsuccessful (page 84).

4. The performance of ESL and bilingual students is lower than that of other students on most objective measures including TEAMS and achievement testing. However, the performance levels of the two special language groups are similar. In addition, students in the two programs master the essential elements at nearly the same rate (pages 42, 56, and 57).

5. Students in both programs achieve large gains in achievement as measured by both achievement tests and TEAMS. Students in both programs also exhibit large gains in oral language proficiency as measured both objectively and subjectively (pages 55 and 57).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE....i

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION

Background....1
Definitions....2
Current Bilingual Programs....2
Research Efforts - A Selective Review of Literature on Bilingual Education....5
Need for the Study....11
Three-Phase Study....11
Broad Research Goals....12
Summary of Findings From Phase I Study of Bilingual Programs....13

II. EVALUATION STRATEGY

Introduction....15
Measures of Success....15
Target Population....16
Questionnaire Development....17
Data Acquisition....18
Data Analysis....18

III. FINDINGS

Introduction....20
Campus Information....23
Student Information....45

IV. DISCUSSION

Introduction....85
Student Issues....85
Instructional Strategies....88
Teachers and Aides....88
Parents....88
Summary Statement....89
References....90

Appendices

A. DEMOGRAPHIC CODING USED FOR STUDENT SURVEY

B. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

C. EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN RULE AND STATUTE

D. COMPARISON OF STUDIES

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1A:	Number and Percent of All Campuses With Bilingual Programs Included in Study by ADA Grouping From the Analyze Procedure	21
1B:	Number and Percent of All Campuses With ESL Programs Included in Study by ADA Grouping From the Analyze Procedure	21
2:	Distribution of Teacher Experience in Bilingual Education Programs for Districts With More Than 1,000 ADA	23
3:	Instructional Approaches by Grade Span From Districts With More Than 1,000 ADA	25
4:	Instructional Arrangements by Grade Span From Districts With More Than 1,000 ADA	26
5:	Percent of Students Exiting the Instructional Programs	29
6:	Mean Percent of Student Exit Rates	30
7:	Exit Rate Differences Between Bilingual and ESL Programs by Demographic Categories	31
8:	Regression Analyses of Exit Rates for Bilingual and ESL Programs - Grades PK - 6	33
9:	Percent of Students Promoted in the Two Instructional Programs	35
10:	Mean Percentage of Student Promotion Rates	36
11:	Regression Analyses of Promotion Rates for Bilingual and ESL Programs - Grades PK - 6	38
12:	Percent of Students Needing Remediation in the Two Instructional Programs	39
13:	Need for Remediation by Grade Level and Exit Status	39
14:	Percentage of Students With High Scores in the Bilingual and ESL Programs	41
15:	Percentage of Students Rated as Passing Sections of the TEAMS Test	42
16:	Percentage of Students Rated as Mastering Sections of the TEAMS Test	42

17: Percentage of Students Rated as Mastering Sections of the TEAMS by Language of Instruction.....42

18: Summarization of Performance Contrasts Between Two Approaches in Special Language Programs.....43

19: Summarization of Performance Contrasts Between Two Approaches in Special Language Programs With Restriction on Campus Type.....44

20: Number of Students in Sample Within Particular District Categories.....46

21: Numbers of Students in Various Demographic Categories.....48

22: Percent of Students in the Bilingual and ESL Program.....49

23: Values of Variables Composing Computed Success Measure.....52

24: Distribution of Students' Performance on Selected Test Measures.....53

25: Percent of Students Changing From One English Achievement Test Performance Category to Another.....55

26: Distribution of Student Performance on Essential Elements, Promotion, English Reading Grade Level, and Oral Language Proficiency.....56

27: Bilingual Regression Analysis for Student Variables Predicting Success (Grades 1-6).....58

28: ESL Regression Analysis for Student Variables Predicting Success (Grades 1-6).....59

29: ESL Regression Analysis for Student Variables Predicting Success (Grades 7-12).....60

30: Distribution of Successful Rated Students in the Bilingual Program by Schooling in the Native Country.....62

31: Percent of Students Rated Successful by Number of Retentions.....63

32: Percent of Students Rated Successful by Percent of Time Using Native Language in Classroom.....64

33: Percent of Students Rated Successful by Number of Absences.....64

34: Percent of Bilingual Students Rated Successful by Number of Extracurricular Activities.....65

35: Percent of Students Needing Indicated Levels of Intervention....65

36: Bilingual Regression Analysis for District Demographic Predicting Success (Grades 1-6)....66

37: ESL Regression Analysis for District Demographic Predicting Success (Grades 1-6)....67

38: ESL Regression Analysis for District Demographic Predicting Success (Grades 7-12)....67

39: Bilingual Regression Analysis for General Program Characteristics Predicting Success (Grades 1-6)....69

40: ESL Regression Analysis for General Program Characteristics Predicting Success (Grades 1-6)....70

41: ESL Regression Analysis for General Program Characteristics Predicting Success (Grades 7-12)....71

42: Percent of Bilingual Students Rated Successful by Dual Service....72

43: Percent of Bilingual Students in Grades 1-6 Rated Successful by Dual Service Selected for Students Scoring Below the 20th Percentile in Achievement....72

44: Percent of Students Rated Successful by Number of Reduced/ Modified Content Classes Per Day....73

45: Percent of Time in Native Language Instruction for Bilingual Students by Success (Grades 1-6)....74

46: Percent of Students Rated Successful by Size of Special Language Classroom....74

47: Bilingual Regression Analysis for Instructional Strategies Predicting Success (Grades 1-6)....75

48: ESL Regression Analysis for Instructional Strategies Predicting Success (Grades 1-6)....76

49: ESL Regression Analysis for Instructional Strategies Predicting Success (Grades 7-12)....77

50: Percent of Students Rated Successful Given Instruction Using All of the Essential Elements at Same Depth as Regular Students (Grades 1-6)....78

51: Bilingual Regression Analysis for Teacher Variables Predicting Success....79

52: ESL Regression Analysis for Teacher Variables Predicting Success (Grades 1-6).....80

53: ESL Regression Analysis for Teacher Variables Predicting Success (Grades 7-12).....81

54: Bilingual Regression Analysis for Parent Variables Predicting Success (Grades 1-6).....82

55: ESL Regression Analysis for Parent Variables Predicting Success (Grades 1-6).....83

56: ESL Regression Analysis for Parent Variables Predicting Success (Grades 7-12).....83

57: Number of Parent/Teacher Conferences During the School Year (Grades 1-6).....84

PREFACE

This report on bilingual education describes findings from Phase II of a three-phase study conducted by the Texas Education Agency from the 1985-86 school year through the 1987-88 school year. The Phase I report presented data obtained from a sample of 144 districts offering bilingual programs in the school year 1985-86. Although the Phase I report was primarily descriptive, it established the criteria necessary to implement Phase II of the study.

Phase II activities constitute the major data collection components of the study. Specifically, questionnaires sent to all districts offering bilingual programs were designed to collect descriptive program information along with selected student performance data. On the basis of the data collected, inferences linking program implementation and student performance are postulated on both campus and student levels.

This report provides an overview of bilingual education programs in Texas. However, the results included in this report may not apply specifically to a particular campus or district, since there is considerable variation in programmatic approach, amount of available resources, and the types of student served. This report identifies statewide issues and provides preliminary standards which allow districts to compare local and statewide performance. Because of the broad nature of this data collection, it is inappropriate to select specific districts for special attention. Instead, the reported results are reflective of the performance of students in bilingual programs statewide. Categorical breakdowns of data, differentiated by selected demographic variables, are also presented for more detailed examination.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Early in the history of this country, new immigrants were faced with learning a new land and in many cases, a new language. Many of these newcomers were thrust into a "sink or swim" situation; that is, they were forced to learn English with little or no support. As a result, immigrants either acclimated to society or retreated into ethnic enclaves.

As the United States continued to grow and accept immigrants, it became apparent that another approach to English language acquisition was necessary, especially for students. The fact that many people native to the United States first learned a language other than English added to this problem. Moreover, children with a native language other than English were often thrust into this same "sink or swim" situation in public schools.

In response to the need for more effective language learning strategies, many schools adopted the "bilingual approach." Bilingual education includes a variety of approaches to language learning, many of which may be included within the general definition of a bilingual approach. Many attempts have been made to implement bilingual education programs in Texas, such as the "German schools" popular some years ago in several parts of the state. Bilingual education, in general, has been the target of debate for some time, generating considerable political and educational controversy.

There are approximately 3,200,000 students in Texas public schools; 274,145 of these are students of limited English proficiency (LEP). That is, students whose primary language is other than English and whose English language skills are such that the students have difficulty performing ordinary classwork in English.

Most of the LEP students in Texas come from Spanish-speaking homes (93 percent), although there are significant numbers of students from Vietnamese, Cambodian, Korean, Japanese, French, German, Farsi, Arabic, and Chinese language groups. In this state, districts with 20 or more students of limited English proficiency in one language group are required to provide bilingual education in the elementary grades. LEP students not being served through bilingual education must receive at least one instructional period of English-as-a-second-language (ESL) daily.

This report on bilingual education does not contrast the presence of bilingual education with the absence of a special language program, nor does it formally contrast major approaches within bilingual education. The report examines instructional practices and outcomes evidenced in bilingual programs and provides information for districts for examining their own programs. As the minority population in Texas increases, the need to have all students prepared to compete in the business world and to be contributing citizens provides a major challenge to the education community. This examination of the current state of bilingual education is one attempt to provide better service to these students.

DEFINITIONS

Although there are many variations and viewpoints of what should be defined as and included in bilingual education, several general parameters were adopted for this study in accordance with the State Board of Education rule contained in Title 19, Texas Administrative Code, §77.352. For the purposes of instructing non- and limited-English speaking children, two basic programs are defined in the 1986 *Guidelines for Language Usage in Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language Programs*. Although there are variations in the implementation of these basic programs, the two basic programs are: Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE), in which the primary language of the student is used as a medium of instruction only until the student masters English; and English as a second language (ESL), which is instruction in English listening, speaking, reading, and language through the use of any one or a combination of methods for teaching English to primary speakers of other languages. (ESL is one of six required components of a bilingual education program in Texas.) Although the teacher is the primary model, language is also acquired through peer interaction, the media, and the general environment. These methods will be collectively referred to as "special language programs" in this report.

Review of literature on bilingual education programs indicates several reasons why these programs are difficult to evaluate and why interpretation of results should be examined with caution. Some of the difficulties encountered in evaluating bilingual education programs stem from the diversity of bilingual programs; disagreements among educators regarding the goals of bilingual education, methods used to instruct students, and the criteria used to determine a student's success or failure (e.g., promotion rates, exit rates, achievement test scores, etc.); disputes regarding appropriate evaluation designs; and continuous modification of programs. Furthermore, there is much disagreement concerning the testing instruments used to assess English proficiency, which is partially a result of the small number of language assessment instruments available.

CURRENT BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

The following historical descriptions of federal and state bilingual programs provide background information for this report.

Federal Title VII Programs

In 1968, the "Bilingual Education Act" was added as Title VII to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. Title VII drew attention to children with educational problems resulting from their being "linguistically different". The original aim of Title VII was to provide seed money to local education agencies (LEAs) for new programs designed to meet the needs of children of limited English speaking ability. Specifically, these children were from families with incomes below $3,000 per year and in schools having a high concentration of students with limited English speaking ability.

In 1974, *Lau v. Nichols* changed the way bilingual education had been regarded. The U.S. Supreme Court stated that schools receiving federal aid were legally obligated to provide children of limited English speaking ability full participation in the educational process while learning English. The *Lau* ruling was followed by informal guidelines, issued by the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, referred to as the "Lau Remedies." In addition *Lau* significantly influenced state statutes designed to guarantee quality education for children with limited English speaking ability.

Local education agencies must meet Title VII ESEA program requirements to receive federal funds. In 1969-70, border communities in Texas were the first to establish programs with Title VII funds. Title VII funding for the 1969-70 school year was $1,669,590. For the 1986-87 school year, Texas received $4,407,540 in Title VII funds. Aside from providing funding to LEAs to implement, expand, and improve the required programs, Title VII funds are also available to state agencies. Funds to state agencies are used to collect data on LEP students, coordinate technical assistance, and provide training to recipients of Title VII funds. The Texas Education Agency has been receiving Title VII funds for administrative functions since 1976-77, when it first was granted a sum of $240,000. Funding increased to a peak of $773,000 in 1980-81 but since has decreased to the current (1986-87) funding level of $175,307.

State Funded Bilingual Programs

Bilingual education programs were first made mandatory in 1973 in Texas school districts with 20 or more children of limited English speaking ability (LESA) in one grade level who spoke a common language. Bilingual programs were started at the first grade level and were to be extended one grade level per year to the sixth grade level. The state first appropriated funding for bilingual education programs in 1973-74 at $700,000. These funds did not provide state support by way of allotments to school districts but did provide for state administration. The following year, state funding for bilingual education increased to $2 million with an allotment to districts of $25 per LESA child being served.

Two years later, the law was amended to include mandatory bilingual service for kindergarten. In addition, the amendment removed the mandate for grades 4, 5, and 6 but continued to provide state funds for operational expenses through grade 5. In 1981, the enactment of Senate Bill 477 extended mandatory bilingual and other special language programs from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. The establishment of language proficiency assessment committees (LPACs) to be used in determining eligibility for special language service was also included in this bill. Accordingly, the determination of limited English proficient (LEP) status is made on the basis of oral language proficiency test scores, achievement test scores, and recommendations of

the LPACs. Included in these rules are the following six curriculum requirements for bilingual education:

(1) Basic concepts starting the student in the school environment shall be taught in the student's primary language.

(2) Basic skills of comprehending, speaking, reading, and writing shall be developed in the student's primary language. This component shall provide for a carefully structured and sequenced mastery of the essential elements in language arts in the primary language.

(3) Basic skills of comprehending, speaking, reading, and writing shall be developed in the English language using English as a second language methods. This component shall provide for a carefully structured and sequenced mastery of the essential elements in language arts in the English language.

(4) Subject matter and concepts shall be taught in the student's primary language. This component shall provide for mastery of the essential elements established for mathematics, science, and social studies.

(5) Subject matter and concepts shall be taught in the English language using English as a second language methods. This component shall provide for mastery of the essential elements established for mathematics, science, and social studies.

(6) Attention shall be given to instilling in the student confidence, self-assurance, and a positive identity with his or her cultural heritage. This component shall be an integral part of the total curriculum and not a separate subject. It shall address history and cultural heritage of the student's primary language and the history and culture of the United States.

The education reform bill of 1984, House Bill 72, further affected bilingual/special language education by adding prekindergarten programs and summer school programs as well as increasing state funding for special language programs. The State Board of Education followed this legislation with revisions to Chapter 77 (the bilingual rules) of Title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code.

The number of LEP students served in 1974-75 was 26,628 and by 1986-87 the number had increased to 285,733. School districts' funding sources currently include state allocations, local funding, and occasionally federal Title VII supplements. The State of Texas provides a basic bilingual/ESL allotment to school districts of approximately $144 per student. In 1986-87, districts received funding equal to the district's adjusted basic allotment multiplied by 0.1. This average amount was adjusted by the Price Differential Index for individual districts and

the total state allotment in 1986 for bilingual education was $33,932,409.

RESEARCH EFFORTS
A SELECTIVE REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

In order to discuss the 1986-87 findings of the bilingual education evaluation, it is important to have an appreciation of the complexities involved in trying to conduct research in this area, as well as the difficulties encountered in interpreting bilingual education research. Based on the conflicting findings proffered in the reviewed literature, it may safely be assumed that bilingual education will continue to be a topic of considerable controversy, both emotionally and politically.

The purpose of this selected review of literature is to define various areas of concern addressed in bilingual education research. Discussion will focus on the findings obtained in published research and on the progress of ongoing studies. Five questions will be addressed: "Which methodologies have been used to evaluate bilingual education?", "Why is it difficult to conduct research in bilingual education?", "Why is it difficult to interpret findings reported from bilingual education research?", "What are some of the findings reported from research in bilingual education?", and "What are some of the current research projects being undertaken in bilingual education?".

Evaluation Methodologies

The three most common methods of evaluating bilingual education programs are pretest and posttest designs, longitudinal or multi-year evaluations, and comparison group methods. The method of pretest and posttest designs involves assessment of the "experimental" group, i.e., the students in a bilingual program before and after program participation. Rodriguez-Brown (1980) points out that this "Before-and-After Design" will indicate only how a particular program works. This evaluation design calls for pretesting the students (usually at the beginning of the school year) and posttesting (at the end of the school year) after the instructional treatment. In essence, one examines the impact of the instructional program on students, as measured by the test administered. However, the effects of other nonprogram-related variables cannot be ruled out, or measured, with this methodology.

A second method commonly used to evaluate bilingual programs is the longitudinal or multi-year evaluation. Following the progress of students in a bilingual program over several years provides information regarding the effectiveness of the program in terms of student achievement. This method is particularly appropriate when program participation will continue beyond one year. In fact, McConnell (1983) and Troike (1981) believe that short-term evaluation of progress may provide misleading results. One of the reasons why a multi-year evaluation is important is "because learning in two languages frequently involves sequencing of instruction first in the native language and then later in the second language." (McConnell 1983).

A third method used to evaluate bilingual programs is the comparison of two or more groups of students served with identifiably different instructional approaches. The idea is to start with equivalent groups and then limit the differences in instruction to only those variables of interest. This important prerequisite is rarely met. This design usually involves comparison of the achievement (e.g., with the use of standardized achievement tests) of students in a bilingual program with that of students in a regular English classroom or between group differences for students in two (or more) bilingual programs using varying instructional approaches.

Difficulties

The difficulties encountered in conducting research on bilingual education usually focus on one or a combination of four concerns. First is the use of a control group. Some research projects attempt to compare a treatment group with a nontreatment group (or control group). In bilingual education research, it would be ideal if one could randomly assign non- and limited-English speaking students to one group which would receive bilingual education and the other to ESL or simply a regular classroom group. After controlling all other variables, the groups could be compared to see if bilingual instruction significantly affected student achievement. This "ideal" method is very difficult to implement, since students who are identified as non- and limited-English speaking must, by law, receive special language instruction (McConnell 1983).

A second evaluation concern regards the use of comparison groups. In contrast to randomly assigning students to programs, as with the control group evaluation approach, a comparison group is usually formed by selecting classrooms of students in specific programs. The comparison group design requires that the groups being compared be matched on critical educational variables. This design is difficult because "if the two groups are not matched on key variables, not only will the results be invalid, but some very misleading and potentially harmful information will be produced" (McConnell 1983). Examples of key variables include socioeconomic status, intelligence quotient, language dominance, motivation, instructional methodologies (including curriculum content and teaching techniques), teacher qualifications, teacher years of experience, and class size. The list of variables grows even longer if the intent is to compare groups from different school districts (e.g., school district characteristics, program content, community characteristics, etc.).

A third concern results from the use of a "norm-referenced group", a commonly used program evaluation method. With this approach, students' skills are measured with nationally standardized achievement tests from which normative information is derived. This normative information allows student performance to be compared on a percentile basis. However, most researchers believe that using norm-referenced scores as a

measure of student performance in a bilingual program is inappropriate. In 1983 McConnell stated that:

> Most nationally standardized tests base their norms on a representative sample of United States children, which would mean primarily English-speaking children from the majority culture. By definition, such a norm group will not resemble children who have been selected for a bilingual program because these children represent a linguistic and ethnic minority group.

A final concern is that persons evaluating bilingual education may be experts in research and evaluation but not in program content. The opposite situation also occurs when those in charge are experts in program content but not in research and evaluation (Rodriguez-Brown 1980). If a team of experts representing both disciplines is not established to conduct the research, undue emphasis may be inappropriately placed on either program content or research design. Understanding how a program is implemented and analyzing data are equally important.

Interpretations

Several issues concern bilingual educators in interpreting research on bilingual education. One issue is that of "variations within a language". Ramirez and McCaulay et.al. (1977) report that this is a neglected area of study and that there is a need for educators to be provided linguistic information. An example of "variations within a language" is that Spanish (vocabulary and meaning) varies according to region as well as to nationality. Mexican-American Spanish is somewhat different from Cuban Spanish or Puerto Rican Spanish. One will even find variations between Mexican-American Spanish spoken in Texas and that spoken in California. Important reasons regarding the investigation of this issue are that it "is essential for textbook writing and curriculum planning if the materials are to be suitable for the children for whom they have been developed" (Ramirez and McCaulay et.al. 1977) and, as reported by Gumperz (1970), "it is not enough for teachers to be given a description of the languages alone, it is also necessary for them to understand the ways in which language is used in the community, since this may affect the learning situation..." The issue of variations within a language must be addressed in the research conducted in order to determine whether the materials used, the curriculum implemented, or the communication between teacher and student are critical factors in the outcomes obtained.

An additional area of concern in interpreting research is the same as that which causes difficulties in conducting research. The use of standardized (norm-referenced) tests is a problem when the norm group is from a linguistically and culturally different population than the population receiving bilingual instruction (McConnell 1983 and Swain 1978). The validity and reliability of many standardized tests are compromised when administered to students with backgrounds that differ both linguistically and culturally from the normative sample. Also, test scores will vary depending on the congruency between the curriculum in bilingual programs and achievement test content (Burry 1981).

Therefore, the use of data based on English achievement tests is generally considered inappropriate. Swain (1978) reports that "...language tests typically measure the skill aspects of language rather than the communicative, creative, or aesthetic aspects.... Test data should be complemented by other data which may well be of a more subjective nonquantifiable nature." The pretest and posttest design is also of concern among educators who believe that results should be examined with caution since results obtained from pretest and posttests may be due to factors other than the program. It is possible that students tested in a bilingual program also receive multiple compensatory services (Burry 1981) and this factor may affect student achievement. In such a situation, a student's progress must be attributed to a combination of treatments.

Another relevant issue, aside from well-defined program goals and curriculum content, is program definition. If a program being evaluated is implemented in a manner inconsistent with the generally accepted definition of the program, the results obtained will misrepresent the program. Troike (1983) reports that "One Korean 'bilingual' program used a Korean teacher twenty minutes a week; the rest of the time was spent in ESL and other activities. Some [bilingual programs] are purely ESL programs."

Other factors to be considered are reported by Tucker (1979) who stresses that "research is needed to examine the effects of factors such as intellectual potential, social status, physical or emotional development, age of entry, presence of native speakers, community stereotypes, teacher characteristics, classroom techniques, sequencing of languages, and social setting on the desirability and efficacy of bilingual education programs." Swain (1978) mentions that problems in interpreting results stem from a lack of information that may be obtained through classroom observations, interviews with teachers and administrators, curriculum materials used, and teacher training and preparation.

Another issue of concern to educators involves comparison of U.S. bilingual programs to Canadian bilingual programs. Canadian researchers tend to use control groups (nontreatment groups) in evaluation designs to investigate program effectiveness, a methodology that is quite difficult to apply in the U.S. Dulay and Burt (1979) describe differences between Canadian and U.S. bilingual programs and concluded that generalizations should not be made from one program to another. The differences described focus on the fact that Anglo-Canadian students are of the middle and upper-middle class while Hispanic students in the U.S. are largely of the lower socioeconomic class. A host of other differences accompany class differences including parental and general community support for bilingualism (a factor present in the Canadian experience but absent in the U.S.), high teacher expectation for Anglo-Canadian students but not for Hispanic students in the U.S., and difficulties associated with educating children from disadvantaged backgrounds, which is evident with Hispanic minority students in the U.S. but not with the middle class Anglo-Canadian students.

Finally, statistical analyses and the misinterpretation of reported results represent a continual concern. First, unless statistical data are supplemented with additional information (e.g. individual case studies) a great deal of information that is interesting or important may go undetected or ignored because it is summarized in statistical analyses (Swain 1978). What is needed to do justice to the programs investigated is to present the whole picture and not just a part of it. Misinterpretation of results can occur when people are not familiar with statistics. It is important for evaluators to inform parents and educators regarding the interpretation of results so that intelligent decisions can be made. For example, statistically significant differences and educationally significant differences are not necessarily the same thing (Swain 1978).

Findings

Many studies have examined the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of bilingual education programs. Among the work supporting the effectiveness of bilingual education are five studies reported by Rudolph C. Troike (1981) in an article entitled "Synthesis of Research on Bilingual Education." A study conducted in St. John Valley, Maine examined a bilingual program implemented for French-speaking students. Prior to the implementation of the bilingual program, French-speaking students scored below grade level on English and mathematics scores. After five years, these students out-performed students in matched schools using English as the sole method of instruction. A longitudinal study conducted in Santa Fe, New Mexico examined Spanish-speaking students in a bilingual program and reported that students in grades 5 and 6 closely approximated the national norm on the Metropolitan Achievement Test in English and in grades 4 - 6 exceeded the norm in mathematics. A third study conducted in San Francisco, California examined results of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills administered to Chinese-speaking students in a bilingual program. Results obtained showed that students in three out of six grades were at or above district and national norms in English and mathematics. In two other grades, students were only one month below the norms. An additional longitudinal study conducted in Pasco, Washington showed that Spanish-speaking students in a bilingual program, after three or more years of attendance, improved from the 14th to 70th percentile in mathematics and from the 10th to 50th percentile in English reading. The final study described by Troike was conducted on the Navajo reservation in Rock Point, Arizona. This longitudinal evaluation found that students in a bilingual program performed above grade level in English reading by the end of their sixth year. It was also reported that students in an ESL program were over a year below grade level in reading and were falling further behind each year.

Among the most notable large-scale studies concluding that bilingual education is not effective in producing significant differences in achievement among LEP students are the 1978 American Institutes for Research (AIR) study by Danoff et al. and the 1981 Baker and deKanter study. The AIR study examined a national sample of 38 bilingual programs which had operated for at least four years. During the 1975-76 school year, the performance of approximately 7,000 students (in grades

2 - 6) was examined. For the following school year (1976-77), a smaller sample of these students (4,000) was followed to determine program effects. This study found that students enrolled in bilingual education did not achieve over and above the students in a traditional classroom (Castellanos, 1985). The Baker and deKanter (1981) study concluded, after disqualifying 90 percent of the 300 studies examined, that "The case for the effectiveness of transitional bilingual education is so weak that exclusive reliance on this instruction method is clearly not justified...each school district should decide what type of special program is most appropriate for its own unique setting." Both of these studies cast doubts as to the effectiveness of bilingual education programs and initiated evaluations and critiques to disprove the results obtained.

The following discussion exemplifies the controversy involved in researching bilingual education and the disagreement among educators and researchers as to the findings obtained. Ann C. Willig (1985) reanalyzed the same body of literature that Baker and deKanter reviewed, pointed out flaws in their study, and found evidence in favor of bilingual education. Keith Baker (1987) criticized Willig's meta-analysis on the research literature he published in 1981 by stating that Willig's meta-analysis did not address conclusions addressed in the Baker and deKanter study and by exposing flaws in her meta-analysis. Regarding the 1978 AIR study by Danoff, K. N. Nickel (1979) responded by pointing out several limitations to the AIR study; whereupon Danoff and Coles (1979) responded to Nickel's criticism and stood by their original conclusions. While methodological shortcomings may partially explain diverse findings, other explanations include differences among studies in research questions, short-term versus long-term focus, selected outcome measures, and predisposition to outcomes supportive of particular positions.

Current Research

Among the most current research projects in bilingual education are those sponsored by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA). However, final reports will not be published for six months to one year from the completion date of the studies. Furthermore, half of the projects reported in the March 1987 Forum (newsletter published by the National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education) have been given extensions as of this writing. The first study mentioned is entitled "Longitudinal Study of Immersion Programs for Language-Minority Children." This project is contracted to SRA Technologies and began in October 1983. The completion date has been extended to March 1989. This longitudinal study produced a descriptive study of national immersion projects during the first year and will continue to look at immersion, transitional bilingual education, and bilingual education programs taught in non-English languages.

The second study mentioned is entitled "National Longitudinal Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Services for Language-Minority Limited-English-Proficient Students." This project is contracted to Development Associates and data collection has been completed as of December 1987. A Descriptive Phase Report on Limited-English-Proficient students and

the services from schools they attend, as well as an estimate of the numbers of LEP students nationwide, was made in a December 1984 report. A second report in June of 1986 described the characteristics of LEPs, their language groups, achievement test scores, and the schools, programs, and teachers serving them. A final report on all data collected has not yet been released.

Another study mentioned in the March 1987 Forum is entitled "Refinement and Field Test of Evaluation Procedures and Materials for ESEA Title VII Evaluation Procedures and Materials for ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Projects." This study, conducted by SRA Technologies, began in July 1985 with data collection completed in December 1987. The major focus of the study has been field testing and refinement of a user guide or manual for Title VII projects, geared toward teachers and administrators. In addition, a fourth study sponsored by OBEMLA is entitled "Survey of Parents of Bilingual Education Students." This study, contracted to Education Testing Service, began in October 1985 and has been extended until May 1988. This survey looks at the attitudes of parents of language minority students toward bilingual programs and at the link between parent and student information exchange.

Another study described in the March 1987 Forum is entitled "Selection and Exit Procedures for Bilingual Education Programs." This study, begun in October 1984 under the direction of Palavin Associates, is scheduled to be completed by April 1988 and will determine the consistency of methods used in identifying LEPs. Testing and procedures used to determine program entry/exit for LEP students were collected and one group of students was tested before, during, and after enrolling in a program. The last project mentioned in the Forum is entitled "A Programmable Computer Synthesized Speech Module for Bilingual Education." This study began in September 1985 and data collection was completed in September 1987. NOVCOM Systems was contracted to develop an experimental voice synthesizer for teaching and translating bilingual curriculum.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Although there have been many studies of individual programs, a study of the general state of bilingual education in Texas, from both an implementation and an outcome point of view has not been conducted. This might be summarized in the questions, "What are we doing?" and "What do we have to show for what we have done?" Although no study can answer all of the questions raised regarding bilingual programs, this study attempts to provide a statewide overview of current practices, to identify those most associated with success, to provide some standards against which districts can measure their programs, and possibly, to suggest areas for more detailed examination.

THREE-PHASE STUDY

One of the difficulties in designing any study is selection of the program aspects to be examined. To balance the limitation of restricted resources and the importance of the evaluation results, a three-phase

approach was determined to provide the most effective investigation method, covering a maximum number of program components. Due to conflicting results in published research efforts, it was important to look at as many process and product variables as possible. The terms process and product refer respectively to implementation and outcome issues.

BROAD RESEARCH GOALS

While some objectives have been modified since the beginning of the study, the major goals of this research effort may be summarized as:

(1) What forms of bilingual education are being offered for students?

(2) What student outcomes may be attributed to the program?

Within these very broad goals are many potential evaluation objectives and strategies. The overarching goal is, of course, to better serve students. For the purposes of this study, the simple approach of collecting pretest and posttest scores on all students receiving special language instruction was unsatisfactory. In addition, simply identifying programs "doing a good job" is fraught with generalization difficulties because of the diversity of Texas school districts and students.

Approaching the problem from both a campus and student level provided a combination of program-level information and student-specific information, allowing comparisons on different levels of information. The technique of using many "vantage points" when viewing the data should be particularly helpful to the audiences served by this study. In that regard, each of the three phases has different sub-goals to enable the realization of the two main study goals.

Phase I

The goals of the first phase of this study (1985-86) were the identification of the most valid and accessible data sources, refinement of evaluation questions, development of program descriptions, and compilation of fiscal expenditures. An overview of the findings of Phase I is presented immediately before the Evaluation Strategy section of this report.

Phase II

The goals of this phase (1986-87) were modified to some extent after completion of the first phase. Basically, district-level information was extended and requested at the campus level. A notable addition was the collection of performance data in the form of exit rates and promotion, retention, and placement rates. Two of the goals of this phase were to link performance to program implementation and to examine the relationship between campus or district demographics and performance. Another goal was to take this analysis one step further using student data. The student data provides specific background

information, performance measures, program implementation information, data regarding teacher characteristics, and information regarding the level of parental involvement.

Phase III

This phase will use information from Phase II to identify specific campuses using successful practices and characterized by outstanding student performance. These campuses will be identified from a variety of district types which serve a mixture of different types of students. The identification of exemplary campuses, coupled with the specific information in Phase II, should aid in implementing technical assistance efforts directed toward improving bilingual programs.

Before delineating the specific research strategy of this study, a brief review of the findings from Phase I is presented as background information for the interested reader.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM PHASE I STUDY OF BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

As noted, the Phase I portion of this study concentrated on developing the evaluation questions pertinent to the overall goals of the study. The following is a very brief summary of that phase. Complete information regarding the findings of Phase I of the study is available in the Phase I report, dated February 1987.

The Phase I evaluation strategy consisted of a data collection instrument sent to a sample of 144 districts, which was supplemented by on-site visits to several school districts to interview principals, teachers, and program directors. Additional data were obtained from Agency files to supplement the questionnaires sent to the selected districts.

It must be pointed out that these data were collected in a restricted sample for specific reasons and, as a result, the reliability of broadly based generalizations of these findings is unknown.

Phase I Findings

1. There are approximately 7,800 certified bilingual teachers and 1,800 ESL endorsed teachers in Texas providing instruction to students.

2. The majority of school districts surveyed favored the instructional arrangements of self-contained, resource (pull-out), bilingual instruction all day, and aides in the class for lower grade levels.

3. The secondary schools appear to favor multiple grade and resource (pull-out) instructional arrangements.

4. A variety of instructional approaches are used by school districts for both elementary and secondary grade levels. In the larger districts, the instructional approach that appears to be more

popular is bilingual while smaller districts favor ESL instruction. (This is not unusual since smaller districts are more likely to have fewer than 20 students of the same language in any one grade level and therefore are only required to provide ESL for language arts instruction.)

5. The majority of districts surveyed indicated that English achievement test scores, Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) scores, and oral language proficiency test scores should be used as outcome measures for the program.

6. Teachers' opinions included comments on a lack of coordination with regular programs, the need for educating the public about bilingual education, additional efforts required for special language teachers, and the desire to do away with English language achievement testing.

7. Principals' opinions were generally supportive of the program. A few indicated they would like to implement only an ESL program and some principals said they would like more assistance in the transition of students from bilingual programs to regular or ESL programs.

These results were considered in the final development of the evaluation strategy planned for Phase II of the study. Attempts to correct specific weaknesses of the procedures used in Phase I were also incorporated into the Phase II strategy. Specific evaluation strategies are presented in the next section of this report.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION STRATEGY

INTRODUCTION

The second phase of this study had two main goals, the first being the development of a statewide overview of bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) programs as currently implemented. However, this report does not include descriptions of how these programs could or should be implemented. The second goal was to identify practices associated with successful and unsuccessful limited English proficient (LEP) students in bilingual and ESL programs. While the first goal is perhaps most useful for Legislative and State Board of Education planning, the second goal is anticipated to be useful in the development of local programs seeking to improve services to students.

The strategy for data collection during this phase included a campus questionnaire and a student questionnaire. The evaluation was designed to collect general descriptions of bilingual and ESL programs and to identify specific instructional practices associated with successful LEP students in these two programs.

This chapter presents descriptions of the measures of success, the targeted population, the data collection instruments, the data acquisition, and the analysis process used in this study.

MEASURES OF SUCCESS

A brief discussion of the term "success" is warranted before proceeding with the evaluation strategy. Success, or lack of it, historically has been attributed to programs on the basis of student performance on singular outcomes such as test scores, grades, attendance, or drop-out rates. While each of these measures has been espoused in various studies or legally mandated evaluations, in actuality most programs hope to achieve positive changes across a broad spectrum of these outcomes. In that regard, the term success as used in this study encompasses the following variety of definitions:

- Achievement test scores
- Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) scores
- Oral Language Proficiency Measures
- Promotion/retention/placement rates
- Exit rates from the program
- Mastery of essential elements

While an extensive list of outcomes is possible, only a finite number can be practically examined in any one study. This list encompasses six of the most frequently mentioned measures of success in Phase I of this study. Interviews with selected district and Agency staff were used to confirm the appropriateness of these measures.

An additional, subjective measure of success was collected in the study. Because some indices of success may have little to do with objective measures, districts were given the opportunity to rate students as successful or nonsuccessful according to local standards. Analyses of

the contrasts and agreements between objective and subjective measures of success were expected to provide interesting results.

TARGET POPULATION

Selection of Campuses

The original intent of this study was to request that staff on every campus with a bilingual and/or ESL program complete a data collection instrument. However, during the data collection phase several district coordinators indicated that some campuses would not be able to provide the requested data in a reliable manner. Rather than force an ill-considered response from all campuses, quality responses from a sample of campuses (selected by the districts themselves) was determined to represent a reasonable compromise for data collection.

Student Sampling

The student questionnaire was designed to be completed for LEP students participating in either a bilingual or ESL program. In the development of the design, two sampling plans were considered, (1) a stratified-by-district, random student selection within the district approach and (2) a stratified-by-district, purposive student selection sample. Although there was a need to stratify by district type and grade level, the issue of random versus purposive student selection was carefully considered. Random selection (e.g. every third student arranged alphabetically) has the advantage of being truly representative, and therefore, results could be generalized to the entire population. However, intentional, as opposed to random, selection of students presents a potential difficulty. Given tendencies to select the best students in order to reflect well upon the district, it was suspected that an attempt to obtain a truly random selection of students might, in actual practice, provide a highly biased sample.

Because one goal of the study was to identify successful and non-successful instructional practices associated with bilingual and with ESL programs (as evidenced through individual student performance) it was decided that the best strategy was to request district staff to "randomly" select students meeting certain specified criteria. Although this purposive selection might seem to limit the ability to generalize the findings to all bilingual and ESL programs, it makes the intent of the study very clear and helps ensure selection of students from the targeted populations. As discussed earlier, the campus surveys were the intended source of data to be used in discussing the overall impact of the program. The representativeness of the student data collected with this approach, as it relates to the entire population of LEP students, was examined in the process of data analysis.

To obtain accurate and honest responses, specific district identification was not included on the student response sheets. While this prevented precise determination of the districts returning the questionnaires, analysis indicated little systematic deletion which might seriously bias the results. Analysis by district type was made possible through the use of a demographic code. This code was

specifically constructed so that no one district had a unique code, again guarding against specific student, staff, or district identification. This structure resulted in a slight "blurring" of district categories but retained sufficient resolution for meaningful analysis. The various code categories are delineated in Appendix A.

To reflect the multi-faceted definition of success desired in this study, three criteria were used to obtain students for the sample. Districts were instructed to select students who were determined to be successful and nonsuccessful within each of three categories: (1) performance on TEAMS testing, (2) promotion/retention, and (3) subjective, district-defined measures. Student selection requests sent to districts were stratified by grade level and by program type (for example, bilingual or ESL). A computer-generated list describing the specific numbers and types of students requested (example in Appendix B) was provided to each district contact person. A relatively small number of students (ranging from six to 36 depending upon district size) were to be included in the sample from each district. Because of a lack of students meeting requested grade level and success criteria, limited substitution of students from different grade levels was permitted. Approximately one-third of the districts chose this option with the remaining deleting questionnaires for students not meeting requested criteria. The random assignment of student type and grade levels across all districts reduced the possibility of systematic bias in the data collection.

QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

Questionnaires reflecting the two major goals of the study - to provide a general description of bilingual education programs statewide and to identify successful instructional practices associated with bilingual and ESL programs - were developed based upon a number of different sources. State statute and State Board of Education rule contain various evaluation requirements which are included in Appendix C. In addition, specific charges and inquires for summary and detailed data from the Texas Legislature and the Board were instrumental in the selection of the specific evaluation topics. Other sections of the questionnaires were designed in response to the more general charge in Texas Education Code §11.63 (a) (3):

> seek to assist local school districts in developing effective and improved programs of education through research and experimentation, consultation, conferences, and evaluation...

In designing a data collection instrument responsive to these charges, a variety of sources were consulted. These included the results from Phase I of the study, Agency program staff, selected district program and evaluation staff, and previously published research.

Campus Questionnaire

Two campus questionnaires (Appendix B) were developed for districts with more and less than 1,000 average daily attendance (ADA), respectively.

This dichotomy allowed small districts, with more limited resources, to provide less information and eliminated the relatively unstable data inherent in small numbers of students at each grade level in these districts.

In general, the questionnaires requested information on the numbers of instructors assigned to bilingual and ESL programs and on the degree of teacher experience. Information on the number of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch and those receiving instruction in more than one program (dual service) was requested from all campuses. Instructional arrangements and approaches used in the bilingual and ESL programs were collected from campuses in districts with more than 1,000 ADA. Also collected was student performance information, by grade level, for LEP students remaining and exiting the bilingual and ESL programs.

Student Questionnaire

One form of the student questionnaire was used for all campuses for both the bilingual and ESL programs (Appendix B). The questionnaire consisted of 77 questions contained in sections covering student background information, performance measures, general and specific program implementation, teacher counts and experiences, and parental involvement. These questions were developed in consultation with selected district staff as well as program staff at the Agency. All responses were entered on scannable answer sheets for electronic processing.

DATA ACQUISITION

All data collection instruments were sent to district superintendents, to be forwarded to district contact persons, in packages containing the requested number of student questionnaires and a printout indicating types of students to be selected. An estimated number of campus-level questionnaires were sent to each district based on expected numbers of campuses with bilingual and ESL programs. Campuses with both a bilingual and ESL program were instructed to complete the questionnaire twice, once for each program. The packet also included detailed data collection instructions for district and campus contact persons, definitions, and a letter from the commissioner of education urging participation in the study.

The packages were mailed to districts in the early part of May, 1987. Contact people in the districts were allowed until September 1, 1987, to return the campus questionnaires and until September 30, 1987, to return the student questionnaires.

DATA ANALYSIS

Quality Control and Data Entry

Data collection instruments were scanned for obvious errors before being submitted for processing. Student questionnaires were examined for stray markings and general condition of the scan sheet. In some cases,

responses were transferred from physically damaged sheets to intact forms. Campus questionnaires were examined for correct type and general reasonableness of response. For example, forms were examined to ensure that percentages were not given where number of students was requested. Whenever possible, districts were contacted for correction of questionable data.

Data from the student questionnaires were transferred to magnetic tape for storage at the Agency through the use of data processing equipment at the Region XX Education Service Center. Data from the campus questionnaires were entered by on-line key entry personnel at the Agency. All data were transferred to disk storage for analysis.

Statistical Analysis

All analyses were accomplished using the SAS statistical package installed on the Agency mainframe computer. The following analyses were conducted when appropriate:

- Means and standard deviations
- Frequencies
- Cross tabulation tables
- Multiple correlation/regression
- Factor analysis

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

Before presenting the results of the analyses, it should be noted that this report is based on information gathered after bilingual and ESL programs had been in operation the entire school year. Since the data were not obtained from a strictly controlled experimental research design, attempts to draw inferential conclusions from the data should be undertaken with considerable caution. However, the data are presented in a manner which allows performance contrasts among selected values of student and district demographic categories. For example, data showing that the very largest districts have lower promotion rates than other districts should not be interpreted as causal. That is, it is not reasonable to expect that simply having more students in the district would lead to lower rates of promotion. An alternative, and more likely, hypothesis is that some other instructional factor associated with larger districts, such as higher student/instructor ratios, might adversely affect promotion rates. Correlation neither implies nor precludes a causal relationship.

The tables and regression analyses presented here are correlational in nature. In other words, they indicate that phenomena occur together, although one variable may not be causally linked to another either directly or indirectly. Differences indicated, however, are "real" in the sense that they are evident in the data collected. Where appropriate, statistical associations and probability of occurrence will be presented. These comparative presentations should prove useful to those desiring to develop or modify instructional strategies. Averages (means) are presented throughout the following discussion. The reader should be aware that there will be considerable variation from the average in the descriptions and performance indicators of individual districts and campuses. Accordingly, one should take great care in attempting specific interpretations and in making generalizations from these results.

Rate of Response

While few data collection efforts achieve a 100 percent return, a reasonable rate of return is required before generalization of results is possible. Although the term "reasonable" is open to interpretation, the return rates in this study are considered adequate, even though some of the largest districts returned data from a sample of campuses. The following tables (1A and 1B) indicate the number and percentage of campuses returning responses. Data is presented by each of the ADA categories delineated by the Analyze procedure, a computer program used by the Agency to summarize data by selected district demographic variables. Three of these categories will be used extensively in the Findings section of this report. Note that the percentage of campuses reporting within each ADA category is computed on the basis of all campuses within a district not only those with bilingual/ESL programs. As a result, the rate of response is a conservative figure, since many campuses do not have special language programs. An accurate count of the number of campuses with bilingual/ESL programs was not available at the time this report was prepared. Although the exact percentage of all

campuses with programs returning these data collection instruments is unknown, the figures of 14.3 percent (bilingual) and 29.7 percent (ESL) of the total number of campuses in the state represent a more than adequate sample. Furthermore, data presented later will indicate that the percentage of bilingual and ESL students included in the study is actually larger than the percentage of campuses participating in the study. Although Tables 1A and 1B show variations in rate of return among the various ADA categories, the percentages obtained provide an adequate basis for generalization in all categories. State Board of Education rule stipulates that bilingual programs will be provided if the districts identifies at least 20 LEP students per grade level with the same language. Accordingly, the percentage of campuses with bilingual versus ESL programs will differ by size of district. Many small districts will not have an adequate number of LEP students either to be required or to be able to offer a bilingual program.

TABLE 1A
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF ALL CAMPUSES WITH BILINGUAL PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN STUDY BY ADA GROUPING FROM THE ANALYZE PROCEDURE

ADA GROUPINGS	NUMBER RETURNED	PERCENT OF CATEGORY
More than 50,000	222	27.1
25,000 -49,999	168	27.3
10,000 -24,999	211	20.2
5,000 - 9,999	112	26.7
3,000 - 4,999	74	11.8
1,600 - 2,999	43	8.4
1,000 - 1,599	5	1.2
500 - 999	4	.7
Less than 500	0	0.0
Statewide	839	14.3

TABLE 1B
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF ALL CAMPUSES WITH ESL PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN STUDY BY ADA GROUPING FROM THE ANALYZE PROCEDURE

ADA GROUPINGS	NUMBER RETURNED	PERCENT OF CATEGORY
More than 50,000	316	38.5
25,000 -49,999	314	51.0
10,000 -24,999	394	37.8
5,000 - 9,999	122	29.1
3,000 - 4,999	239	38.2
1,600 - 2,999	148	28.9
1,000 - 1,599	53	12.2
500 - 999	77	13.4
Less than 500	71	8.8
Statewide	1,734	29.7

There were 4,065 student questionnaires sent to districts indicated as offering a special language program. Of those, 2,103 were returned, with approximately equal percentages returned for ESL and bilingual students. As will be discussed later, there was little evidence of differential return rates from districts in the various demographic categories.

Presentation Strategy

The remainder of this chapter is divided into two sections: Campus and Student. This division is necessary in view of the diverse nature of the data collected and reflects the goals of this phase of the study. Both the campus and student data are further subdivided into descriptive and performance portions.

CAMPUS INFORMATION

DESCRIPTION

This section of the findings is specific to campus information and is divided into description and performance portions. In the description portion, results are presented concerning (1) campus and instructor attributes, (2) student attributes by campus, and (3) instructional strategies employed within the campus. The performance portion follows with results concerning student outcomes obtained at the campus-level.

CAMPUS AND INSTRUCTOR ATTRIBUTES

Descriptive information about the campus and its instructors was requested, as part of the campus data collection effort. In addition, standard county-district-campus numbers were requested to provide a link to Agency files containing demographic information.

Responses indicate that campuses in districts with more than 1,000 ADA have had bilingual programs for an average of 9.7 years and ESL programs for an average of 6.1 years. The amount of experience with bilingual and ESL programs varied considerably among districts ranging from one to more than 20 years of program implementation for both types of programs.

Information regarding the numbers of bilingual and ESL teachers and the extent of their experience with special language programs was collected to provide information parallel to data regarding overall campus experience with the programs. A total of 5,086 teachers were included in this report, however, this number reflects the total number of staff, not the percentage of staff time spent in special language instruction. The actual commitment of special language teachers ranges from one hour per day to full-day. The percentages presented in the table below indicate the relative experience of teachers in bilingual and ESL programs.

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF TEACHER EXPERIENCE
IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
FOR DISTRICTS WITH MORE THAN 1,000 ADA

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	PERCENT OF BILINGUAL TEACHERS	PERCENT OF ESL TEACHERS
1 year	9.1	13.6
2-3 years	15.4	23.6
4-5 years	13.1	21.6
6 or more years	62.4	41.2

Table 2 indicates that the largest percentage of both bilingual and ESL teachers have at least six years of experience. There appears to be a more experienced group of teachers in bilingual programs, which closely

follows the finding above of longer average district experience with bilingual programs. The reader is reminded that Table 2 presents the number of years of experience specific to special language programs, not overall teaching experience.

Another contrast between bilingual and ESL teachers was evident in the percent teaching with special permits or waivers. While 23 percent of bilingual teachers were teaching with a special permit or waiver, 46 percent of ESL teachers lacked complete credentials. In other words, nearly half of the ESL teachers were less than qualified, as measured by the need for special permission to instruct.

Although bilingual teachers are more favorably represented in terms of experience in special language programs and teaching credentials, the percentage of ESL teachers with graduate degrees is clearly higher. While 43 percent of bilingual teachers in the sample had earned a graduate degree, 83 percent of the ESL teachers hold an advanced degree.

Differences in the amount of specific program experience between bilingual and ESL teachers can only be addressed through time. However, differences in credentials and graduate education can be addressed through further training.

STUDENT DATA FROM CAMPUS QUESTIONNAIRES

This section of the campus findings provides a discussion of the relationship between program service and eligibility for the federal free/reduced price lunch program. Percentages in the tables of this section may not always add to 100 percent due to rounding.

Student Counts

Data from the fall survey of bilingual programs, obtained from the Division of Special Programs, Funding, and Compliance, indicate that 675,317 students received either bilingual or ESL instructional services during the 1986-87 school year.

Free/Reduced Price Lunch Eligible Students

The relationship between free/reduced price lunch status and service in special language programs is an issue of considerable interest. The data collected for this study indicate that approximately 86 percent of the bilingual and 74 percent of ESL students are eligible for free/reduced price lunch. However, the percentage of ESL students eligible for free/reduced price lunch may be under-estimated, since ESL programs are more common in the higher grade levels and students in these levels frequently are not identified as free/reduced price lunch students. In any case, the percentage is quite high for both types of programs. Moreover, additional analysis indicated that the mean percentage of free/reduced price lunch students did not differ significantly by district size.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES BY CAMPUS

In this section of the campus findings, various instructional arrangements and approaches used in bilingual and ESL programs are discussed along with provision of dual service. Generally, dual service may be characterized as serving a student in more than one special instructional program during the school year. The instructional delivery techniques examined will be collectively referred to as instructional strategies.

Instructional Approaches and Arrangements

The questionnaires included a checklist of various instructional arrangements and approaches. The terms, instructional arrangements and instructional approaches, generally describe program implementation. Arrangements typically refer to the physical setting in which instruction occurs, while approaches typically represent the instructional methodology. Because these terms are not always clearly separable, some arrangements may also be deemed approaches. Furthermore, certain instructional approaches may dictate unique instructional arrangements, while others may not. For example, computerized instruction requires a computer, while mastery learning may occur in a variety of instructional settings.

Tables 3 and 4 present the percentage of campuses using various instructional strategies by grade span (ESL: K-6, 7-8, and 9-12 and Bilingual: K-6 only). Campuses structured with grade divisions, other than those presented, were included in the category best reflecting the grade levels served.

TABLE 3
INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES BY GRADE SPAN
FROM DISTRICTS WITH MORE THAN 1,000 ADA

	PERCENT OF CAMPUSES IN GRADE SPANS USING PARTICULAR APPROACHES			
	BILINGUAL	ESL		
APPROACH	K-6	K-6	7-8	9-12
Mastery Learning	63.7	53.6	58.0	49.8
Computerized Drill and Practice	40.5	36.0	34.2	22.8
ESL for Language Arts	79.7	92.4	91.1	90.2
ESL for Content	73.5	62.0	56.3	50.8
Native Language for Content	84.1	14.7	13.5	9.4
Native Language/Language Arts	85.0	14.8	16.2	11.4
Native Language/Clarification	82.5	29.1	39.9	39.7
Self-paced	40.2	41.3	48.8	46.3
Study Skills	60.3	56.9	71.7	69.1
Test Taking Skills	73.5	62.0	70.6	70.7
Peer Tutor	46.6	44.4	46.1	46.6
Additional Time on Task	54.3	55.1	53.9	52.1
Individual Progress	48.6	52.0	51.2	50.2
Bilingual All Day	61.5	6.6	2.7	0.3
Grouping Heterogeneously	75.8	69.7	58.0	61.9
Grouping Homogeneously	56.9	56.2	61.7	53.4

Although it might be expected that different instructional strategies would be used for different grade spans, an examination of Table 3 indicates that there is little difference in the instructional approaches used in ESL programs across grade spans. For bilingual programs only the elementary grade span is presented, since bilingual programs rarely extend beyond the elementary grades. The percentages in this table represent a duplicated count, since campuses generally employ more than one type of approach. Although the table indicates that use of the approaches varies considerably, districts do appear to use a wide variety of approaches in attempting to tailor instruction to the needs of the students.

The results presented in Table 3 confirm some expectations and indicate one unexpected bilingual strategy. Because bilingual programs typically use the native language extensively, differences between programs were expected in the "Bilingual All Day" and use of native language categories. It also follows that "ESL for Language Arts" would be used more frequently in ESL programs. However, the finding that "ESL for Content" is used slightly more often in bilingual programs is somewhat surprising.

TABLE 4
INSTRUCTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS BY GRADE SPAN
FROM DISTRICTS WITH MORE THAN 1,000 ADA

	PERCENT OF CAMPUSES IN GRADE SPANS USING PARTICULAR ARRANGEMENTS			
	BILINGUAL	ESL		
ARRANGEMENT	K-6	K-6	7-8	9-12
Tutorial	87.3	69.2	69.3	71.7
Self-Contained	84.0	53.7	24.0	22.8
Team-Teaching	35.7	27.3	8.9	8.1
Departmentalized	21.4	23.1	69.8	64.5
Resource Arrangement	57.4	70.8	30.2	22.5
Lab with Computer	46.8	35.8	34.8	23.1
Summer School	69.9	44.1	38.8	34.2
Aide in Class	65.4	33.5	32.6	26.7

It is clear that many different arrangements are employed by campuses to deliver bilingual and ESL services. As opposed to the approaches described in the previous table, however, there are discernible differences among the ESL arrangements selected by campuses in different grade spans. For example, a resource arrangement was used by 70.8 percent of the elementary campuses but only 22.5 percent of the high school campuses in the sample.

Dual Service

The data collection instrument requested that campuses report the percentage of students enrolled in a special language program and a

compensatory program, such as Chapter 1. The percentages of both bilingual and ESL students receiving dual service were nearly equal (65 and 66 percent respectively). With the majority of students being served in more than one special program and a regular program, coordination of instructional programs obviously would be important in avoiding problems associated with conflicting strategies.

Since nearly equal percentages of bilingual and ESL students are receiving dual service, this measure cannot be used to differentiate program performance. Furthermore, examination of dual service by district size and demographic variables revealed no discernible patterns of variation among the districts.

PERFORMANCE

As previously noted, the performance of bilingual and ESL students can be measured in a variety of ways. In this section of the campus findings, four performance measures will be discussed: program exit rates, promotion rates, need for remediation rates, and test scores. Although exit rates and promotion rates may be self-explanatory, the need for remediation rate is derived from a request for the percentage of students "scheduled to receive some other form of instructional services" the next year. Basically, the intent was to investigate the numbers of students who, after exiting the special language program, require additional remediation. In other words, even though language proficiency is considered adequate, these students require additional support to attain an appropriate achievement level. These performance measures as well as test scores must be considered in order to thoroughly examine differences in performance between programs or among campuses. The test score data used for this discussion are Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) results and achievement test information.

EXIT RATES FROM THE BILINGUAL AND ESL PROGRAMS

The exit rate of a special language program is one measure of program performance, since the exited student should be able to function successfully in a regular classroom. In examining the exit rates presented, it must be noted that some districts consider a period of time spent in a compensatory program part of the normal transition sequence. Moreover, in examining exit, promotion, and need for remediation rates, it should be noted that there are differences in the characteristics of both teachers and students in ESL and bilingual programs, as described earlier.

Table 5 presents the mean exit rates for grades PK - 6 for bilingual and PK - 11 for ESL programs. These exit rates refer to the percentage of students leaving the special language program. The LEP population is maintained through a certain amount of recidivism and new LEP students entering the districts. The number of students in these programs is not likely to diminish to zero given these two situations.

TABLE 5
PERCENT OF STUDENTS EXITING THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL	BILINGUAL	ESL
PK	17.0	25.6
K	20.7	26.1
1	20.8	35.0
2	25.6	38.1
3	28.1	35.6
4	24.2	33.0
5	22.9	29.2
6	23.2	32.4
7		23.1
8		32.4
9		30.4
10		37.0
11		40.3

Table 5 indicates rather stable exit rates across grade levels with ESL programs demonstrating higher exit rates, especially for the earliest grade levels. However, the reader is reminded that these rates are based on nonequivalent circumstances. Later in this section, however, selection of campuses based on certain matching criteria allows for more meaningful comparisons between outcome measures.

Demographic Categories

Table 6 presents the average exit rates for prekindergarten through third grade by district size. An average, however, does not mean that every campus or district within a category exhibits that performance. In fact, even within categories containing small numbers of districts, there is considerable variance from the average. In addition, the types of students on a particular campus may differ from those expected according to the district's demographic data. On the other hand, analyses performed using free/reduced price lunch data directly reported for campuses closely compares to district-level demographic information and this consistency tends to indicate that campus and district demographic characteristics are similar. Selected portions of the entire Analyze tables are presented in the interest of reasonable document length. Complete analysis tables are available from the Division of Program Evaluation in a separate document.

TABLE 6
MEAN PERCENT OF STUDENT EXIT RATES

	GRADE LEVEL							
	BILINGUAL				ESL			
	PK	K	1	3	PK	K	1	3
ADA Groupings								
More than 50,000	4.9	10.4	16.1	21.4	8.6	11.0	18.4	28.1
25,000 -49,999	21.3	15.6	17.9	18.4	39.1	23.3	34.0	37.1
10,000 -24,999	15.3	13.5	16.8	23.1	19.3	26.6	36.4	31.5
5,000 - 9,999	12.3	15.1	16.3	34.5	31.2	20.7	23.5	34.4
3,000 - 4,999	31.2	35.3	27.3	29.9	21.7	26.8	39.2	33.3
1,600 - 2,999	19.2	31.3	31.3	34.7	30.0	33.3	31.3	36.7

Less than 1,600 not tabled due to lack of stability of the data.

	GRADE LEVEL							
	BILINGUAL				ESL			
	PK	K	1	3	PK	K	1	3
Minority Percent								
5% Less than 10%	*	*	*	*	*	26.0	61.8	51.2
10% Less than 20%	3.6	23.2	20.6	7.1	45.3	27.4	40.3	41.1
20% Less than 30%	12.8	21.8	15.7	33.1	28.4	20.3	25.8	36.9
30% Less than 50%	24.3	25.7	26.9	27.9	23.5	29.4	38.3	32.0
50% or More	15.4	17.9	18.5	28.3	20.0	27.5	25.8	30.6

* Deleted due to lack of stability of the data.

	GRADE LEVEL							
	BILINGUAL				ESL			
	PK	K	1	3	PK	K	1	3
Percent Low Income								
Less than 20%	19.7	16.3	21.9	31.0	28.5	25.7	40.8	36.6
20% Less than 30%	26.2	20.4	23.0	26.0	21.7	22.3	33.7	42.7
30% Less than 40%	14.8	24.3	16.2	23.8	35.6	23.3	32.6	30.3
40% Less than 60%	20.6	27.3	27.4	39.2	18.8	30.4	30.3	33.3
60% Less than 80%	9.1	15.9	18.0	20.2	*	*	*	*
80% or More	12.5	13.5	15.8	22.9	*	*	*	*

* Deleted due to lack of stability of the data.

In general, the data in Table 6 contain several "bumps". Normally, a trend is evident as a linear change from one group to another with a steadily increasing or decreasing function. Among these data, disruptions (or bumps) exist in the progression of differences between the adjacent levels of categorical variables. However, the categorical boundaries may contribute to the disruptions, since these boundaries

were selected on the basis of structural, political, and other considerations not related to linear divisions. Trends rarely are perfectly smooth, especially with a relatively small number of observations.

Although the data presented contain no smooth trends, it should be noted that exit rates are generally smaller for the very largest districts. This difference seems to be more pronounced for ESL programs than for bilingual programs. Data are not presented when the number of campuses per cell fall below five, making the stability of the data suspect. The data in the percent minority and low income sections of Table 6 display no discernible trend.

The relationship between exit rates for ESL and bilingual programs was examined further through another type of analysis. Exit rates for first and third grade were averaged to increase the stability of the data, and the difference between the averaged exit rates for the two programs was computed. The next table indicates that this difference is far from consistent.

TABLE 7
EXIT RATE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BILINGUAL AND ESL PROGRAMS
BY DEMOGRAPHIC CATEGORIES

	BILINGUAL MEAN OF GRADES 1 + 3	ESL MEAN OF GRADES 1 + 3	DIFFERENCE
ADA Groupings			
More than 50,000	18.8	23.3	4.5
25,000 -49,999	18.2	35.6	17.4
10,000 -24,999	20.0	34.0	14.0
5,000 - 9,999	25.4	29.0	3.6
3,000 - 4,999	28.6	36.3	7.7
1,600 - 2,999	33.0	34.0	1.0
Minority Percent			
10% but Less than 20%	13.9	40.7	26.8
20% but Less than 30%	24.4	31.4	7.0
30% but Less than 50%	27.4	35.0	7.6
50% or More	23.4	28.2	4.8
Percent Low Income			
Less than 20%	26.5	38.7	12.2
20% but Less than 30%	24.5	38.2	13.7
30% but Less than 40%	20.0	31.5	11.5
40% but Less than 60%	33.3	31.8	-1.5

The computed differences between bilingual and ESL programs are not constant across various demographic categories. ESL program exit rates

remain relatively constant across district size; yet, exit rates increase for bilingual programs as district size decreases. The change in exit rates by district size for bilingual programs appears to account for the wide variation in the differences column. Clearly, there is some underlying factor that is fundamentally different between bilingual programs as implemented in districts of different sizes.

The difference column for the percent minority categories displays no clearly defined trends. However, it is apparent that the differences are relatively constant except for the lowest percent minority category. Here, there is a substantial difference in exit rates between the programs. This finding may suggest that ESL is the preferable approach if there is a very small minority population. However, the reader is reminded that this generalization is true on the basis of these exit rates but may not be true on the basis of other performance measures.

The difference column for low income categories indicates relatively constant differences for three of the categories, with ESL programs generally exhibiting higher exit rates. However, within the largest percent of low income category, bilingual programs demonstrate a higher exit rate. Data were not available to allow computation of differences for districts with even higher percentages of low income students. Accordingly, it was impossible to determine if this pattern continues as the percentage of low income students increases above 60 percent.

Instructional Strategies

Exit rates associated with specific instructional strategies are also of interest. However, since the questionnaire instructed the respondents to indicate all instructional strategies used on the campus, the linkage between strategy and an individual outcome is tenuous. As a result, it was impossible to clearly identify differences in exit rates among various instructional strategies.

Regression Analyses

Regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between exit rates and various demographic characteristics of the campuses. The analyses were conducted using the following variables to predict exit rates:

- Years of implementation
- Percentage of teachers on special permits/waivers
- Percentage of teachers with graduate degrees
- Percentage of students with dual service
- Percentage of students on free/reduced price lunch (campus level)
- Teacher experience
- ADA
- Percent minority (district level)
- Percent low income (district level)

A regression model was constructed for both bilingual and ESL programs and the results are presented in Table 8. The actual value of each

parameter estimate cannot be interpreted due to scaling differences within the data. However, the sign of the parameter estimate provides information regarding the direction of the relationship for statistically significant variables and is interpreted by considering the possible values and coding of the variables. The significance of variables is interpreted on the basis of probability (Prob) and the direction of the relationship in the text following the table.

TABLE 8
REGRESSION ANALYSES OF EXIT RATES FOR BILINGUAL AND ESL PROGRAM
GRADES PK- 6

Model:	BILINGUAL F=4.47 Prob<.01 R-square=.261		ESL F=2.26 Prob<.04 R-square=.337	
VARIABLES	PARAMETER	PROB	PARAMETER	PROB
Years of implementation	-0.115	.722	1.128	.025
% teachers permit/waiver	-0.053	.590	-0.088	.773
% teachers graduate deg	0.008	.860	-0.004	.977
% students dual service	0.081	.094	0.293	.084
% students F/RPL* (campus)	-0.126	.303	-0.420	.052
Teacher experience	-12.102	.004	-0.409	.968
ADA	5.372	.001	7.062	.008
Percent minority	9.955	.100	11.163	.220
Percent low income	-5.748	.001	-8.801	.313

* free/reduced price lunch

As may be seen, both models were statistically significant with R-squares of .261 and .337 for bilingual and ESL programs respectively. Furthermore, different variables are significantly related to the exit rate measure for each of the programs. Years of implementation is a statistically significant predictor of ESL exit rates, but not of bilingual exit rates. Generally, more years of ESL experience for the campus is associated with higher exit rates. However, neither the percentage of teachers with special permits/waivers nor the percentage of teachers with graduate degrees is a statistically significant predictor of exit rates for bilingual or ESL programs.

While the percentage of free/reduced price lunch students (campus measure) is marginally significant for ESL programs, it is not significantly related to exit rates for bilingual programs. The direction of the relationship indicates that as the percentage of free/reduced price lunch students increases, ESL exit rates decline. There was a very strong relationship between years of teacher experience in special language programs and exit rates for bilingual programs, although there was no relationship for ESL programs. The direction of this relationship indicates that as the group of teachers is more experienced in special language programs, bilingual exit rates decline. Interpretation of this unexpected relationship is not attempted here, since no logical explanation is readily apparent.

District size was predictive for both ESL and bilingual programs with smaller districts having higher exit rates. While the percentage of minority students was not significantly related to exit rates for either program, the percentage of low income students (district level) was statistically significant for bilingual programs. For ESL programs, the campus-level measure of low income (percentage of free/reduced price lunch) was not significantly related to exit rates. In both cases, however, as the percentage of low income students increases, exit rates decline.

PROMOTION

Although most would agree that exiting the program is an important priority for students and programs, the goal of being promoted may be even more important. Research results continue to indicate the undesirable effects of retention in the elementary grades. For example, Holmes (1983) concluded:

> If, as is often the purported case today, retention of pupils is accomplished with the intention of improving the academic achievement in the basic skills of these pupils, the research does not seem to support this practice. It seems that retained pupils fall behind during the year that they are retained and spend the rest of their academic careers in [a] vain attempt to catch up. (p.4)

Some articles postulate that the uniformly negative effects of retention in the elementary grades have not been generalized to kindergarten and transition programs because of the nature of these programs. However, Shepard and Smith (1986) found that there were no differences between retained kindergarten students and a control group at the end of first grade on mathematics achievement tests or in teacher ratings of reading achievement, math achievement, social maturity, learner self-concept and attention span. The retained children showed an overall gain on a standardized reading test of five points, which translates into one month, over the control group.

In Texas, studies conducted by school districts have indicated that one of the significant predictors of the drop-out rate is whether students are over-age for the grade level. Obviously, not being promoted causes one to be older than other students in the class. The more over-age a student is, the greater the probability of that student leaving school. Thus, as the number of retentions increases, the student becomes less likely to complete school.

Furthermore, a study conducted by the Austin Independent School District (1987) concluded:

> Retention has not helped most elementary students overcome their deficit in learning in the long run. It appears best to provide alternative instruction without retaining most low achievers. If retained, students also need special instruction. At the secondary level, minimizing the number of credit units

repeated, providing intense remediation in basic skills, and promoting students as soon as possible may decrease the likelihood of dropping out.

Issues regarding promotion will be discussed further in the following presentations.

TABLE 9
PERCENT OF STUDENTS PROMOTED IN THE TWO INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL	BILINGUAL	ESL
PK	95.2	89.7
K	90.6	82.0
1	75.3	69.5
2	80.4	76.8
3	81.6	76.0
4	80.5	73.1
5	80.0	76.1
6	78.2	80.5
7		81.1
8		79.7
9		77.7
10		82.1
11		82.6

Table 9 generally indicates a lower promotion rate for ESL programs. The ESL promotion rate is actually higher in grade 6 and relatively constant for the remaining grade levels. Again, bilingual promotion rates for the higher grade levels are not presented due to very small numbers of students in such programs for grades 7 - 12.

Demographic Categories

Table 10 presents promotion rates by three demographic categories. Data are presented in each category for both programs and are subdivided into grade levels PK - 3. Results are presented for selected grade levels in order to simplify the table, since results for the remaining grade levels do not vary significantly among the categories.

TABLE 10
MEAN PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT PROMOTION RATES

	GRADE LEVEL							
	BILINGUAL				ESL			
	PK	K	1	3	PK	K	1	3
ADA Groupings								
More than 50,000	94.3	89.0	75.1	79.2	93.0	87.0	79.1	79.7
25,000 -49,999	96.7	85.3	72.7	75.6	94.5	86.9	78.2	82.1
10,000 -24,999	90.3	90.1	75.1	78.2	59.2	80.4	67.7	70.8
5,000 - 9,999	96.7	91.4	80.1	84.5	100.0	85.1	64.3	73.5
3,000 - 4,999	98.1	92.8	69.0	83.3	93.9	83.0	74.5	82.5
1,600 - 2,999	95.8	90.1	78.9	86.5	90.1	78.4	60.7	73.3

Less 1,600 not tabled due to lack of stability of the data.

	GRADE LEVEL							
	BILINGUAL				ESL			
	PK	K	1	3	PK	K	1	3
Minority Percent								
5% Less than 10%	*	*	*	*	*	86.9	65.6	98.0
10% Less than 20%	98.6	78.3	75.5	92.8	72.4	75.1	74.1	77.1
20% Less than 30%	99.8	88.0	74.7	84.9	94.6	82.1	66.8	68.5
30% Less than 50%	92.7	89.1	71.6	78.9	91.9	85.0	70.2	73.3
50% or More	95.4	92.5	77.3	81.8	86.8	79.6	67.0	82.3

	GRADE LEVEL							
	BILINGUAL				ESL			
	PK	K	1	3	PK	K	1	3
Percent Low Income								
Less than 20%	100.0	79.0	70.9	84.5	82.5	81.2	68.9	79.4
20% Less than 30%	92.2	87.2	75.0	75.2	90.4	78.5	70.1	71.4
30% Less than 40%	100.0	93.3	70.1	79.1	94.8	85.1	76.7	71.1
40% Less than 60%	90.8	89.4	73.0	78.3	91.0	82.8	64.0	80.1
60% Less than 80%	95.0	94.4	83.3	89.2	*	*	*	*
80% or More	98.5	95.3	79.8	85.9	*	*	*	*

* Deleted due to lack of stability of the data.

Although the promotion rate for prekindergarten is included for the sake of consistency, it appeared that various districts interpreted this request for information differently. Accordingly, use or interpretation of the prekindergarten and, to a certain extent, the kindergarten results is limited.

Differences in promotion rates among the ADA categories are not consistent. Furthermore, the percent minority and low income categories also exhibit no clear patterns.

Instructional Strategies

As with exit rates, an attempt was made to differentiate among instructional strategies as associated with promotion rates. Again, given application of a number of strategies on each campus, it was impossible to differentiate between promotion rates for the various instructional strategies.

Regression Analyses

To provide a more thorough analysis of the relationship between promotion rates and various campus demographic characteristics, regression analyses were conducted using the following variables to predict promotion rates:

- Years of implementation
- Percentage of teachers on special permits/waivers
- Percentage of teachers with graduate degrees
- Percentage of students with dual service
- Percentage of students on free/reduced price lunch (campus-level)
- Teacher experience
- District ADA category
- Percent minority (district-level)
- Percent low income (district-level)

A regression model was constructed for both bilingual and ESL programs and the results are presented in Table 11. The actual value of each parameter estimate cannot be interpreted due to scaling differences within the data. However, the sign of the parameter estimate provides information regarding the direction of the relationship for statistically significant variables and is interpreted by considering the possible values and coding of the variables. The significance of variables is interpreted on the basis of probability (Prob) and the direction of the relationship in the text following the table.

TABLE 11
REGRESSION ANALYSES OF PROMOTION RATES FOR BILINGUAL AND ESL PROGRAM
GRADES PK - 6

Model:	BILINGUAL F=2.05 Prob<.04 R-square=.111		ESL F=1.77 Prob<.09 R-square=.222	
VARIABLES	PARAMETER	PROB	PARAMETER	PROB
Years of implementation	0.332	.465	0.195	.598
% teachers permit/waiver	0.284	.047	0.542	.012
% teachers graduate deg	-0.111	.083	-0.007	.933
% students dual service	-0.157	.019	-0.058	.583
% students F/RPL* (campus)	0.247	.091	0.413	.004
Teacher experience	-5.681	.306	2.965	.675
ADA	-2.011	.266	-0.613	.734
Percent minority	-0.312	.972	4.546	.399
Percent low income	1.793	.467	-2.610	.601

* free/reduced price lunch

First, it should be noted that the model for ESL programs was only marginally significant and interpretations should be made with caution. In addition, the R-square for the bilingual model is relatively low at .111. For both models, the percentage of teachers with special permits/waivers is related to promotion rates. Specifically, as the percentage of teachers with special permits/waivers increases, promotion rates increase. This counter-intuitive finding is presented, but no explanation is attempted. Both models indicate that promotion rates increase as the percentage of free/reduced price lunch students increases. However, promotion rates decline in bilingual programs as the percentage of students receiving dual service increases.

Remediation Rates

Another way of looking at the effectiveness of special language programs is to examine the need for remediation following exit from the program. In other words, students may meet the necessary criteria to be exited from the special language program, yet still be in need of additional remedial efforts, such as those provided by a Chapter 1 program. As the next table indicates, there is a difference between the two programs in the need for remediation following exit. Again, no data are presented for the bilingual programs after grade 6 due to the very small number of students reported. Although there seems to be a consistent difference between the programs favoring ESL instruction, the next section demonstrates that this difference must be examined in light of at least one other factor.

TABLE 12
PERCENT OF STUDENTS NEEDING REMEDIATION IN THE
TWO INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL	BILINGUAL	ESL
PK	20.4	12.7
K	25.7	20.7
1	23.8	17.9
2	28.2	18.4
3	32.5	24.0
4	34.7	28.5
5	38.5	34.6
6	42.5	27.7
7		34.5
8		41.1
9		40.4
10		41.2
11		42.9

Exit Strategies Versus Need for Remediation

The need for additional remediation, once the student has exited the special language program, may be determined in many ways. Grades, achievement test scores, TEAMS performance, and teacher recommendation are used with differing degrees by districts in determining student placement. A common theory presumes that holding students in the programs until a higher percentile has been achieved prepares the students better for English-only classwork. The table below examines this hypothesis.

TABLE 13
NEED FOR REMEDIATION BY GRADE LEVEL AND EXIT STATUS

GRADE	BILINGUAL			ESL			PROGRAM CONTRAST	
LEVEL	EARLY	LATE	DIFF	EARLY	LATE	DIFF	EARLY DIFF	LATE DIFF
1	34.4	15.2	19.2	18.5	10.4	8.1	15.9	4.8
2	37.9	15.2	22.7	23.4	12.3	11.1	14.5	2.9
3	39.0	22.1	16.9	15.3	16.6	-1.3	23.7	5.5
4	35.3	22.1	13.2	23.0	15.3	7.7	12.3	6.8
5	35.2	13.6	21.6	21.9	14.0	7.9	13.3	- 0.4
6	42.3	38.6	3.7	53.1	50.0	3.1	-10.8	-11.4

The contrast between "early" and "late" exit was determined by categorizing districts according to the relative percentage of students exiting within particular percentile ranges. A district with more students exiting between the 23rd and 40th percentile than above the 40th percentile was classified as a district espousing an <u>early</u> exit strategy. Conversely, a district with more students exiting above the 40th percentile employs a <u>late</u> exit strategy. It is obvious that many

factors contribute to the relative percentage of students at any given percentile range, but students entering special language programs are generally below the 23rd percentile. Table 13 presents figures for both programs by early and late exit strategies, as well as a column contrasting bilingual and ESL programs. These data were derived from an optional item on the questionnaire and were available from only half of the total number of districts responding to the survey. However, the number is sufficiently large to allow reliable comparisons, although these exit rates will not exactly match those presented earlier for the entire sample of campuses.

One of the interesting findings presented in this table is the significantly higher need for remediation in the sixth grade. The higher rate is associated with required remediation beginning in seventh grade for reading improvement, as determined by percentile scores. This finding will not be considered further, since an external requirement is responsible for the increased need for remediation.

As discussed earlier, the need for additional remediation is generally higher for bilingual programs. As predicted, however, the need for remediation declines as achievement test scores rise. There is roughly a 20 percent difference in need for remediation for the bilingual groups between early and late exit for grades one, two, and five. In contrast, the difference between early and late ESL groups rarely exceeds 10 percent. It may be concluded that a late exit strategy is more effective (as measured by need for remediation) for either program but is particularly more effective for bilingual students.

The far right column of the table compares need for remediation rates between bilingual and ESL programs by early and late exit strategies. Discounting the sixth grade, bilingual programs with an early exit strategy exhibit remediation rates roughly 15 to 20 percentage points higher than those for ESL programs with early exit strategies. However, there is little difference in the amount of additional remediation needed between bilingual and ESL programs employing late exit strategies.

While it appears desirable to require students to progress to a higher achievement level before exiting, it must be remembered that keeping students in a special program for an extended length of time may not be beneficial, as will be examined in the next section. Furthermore, since percentile rankings are based on distributions of student abilities as measured by achievement tests, 50 percent of the students will always score below the 50th percentile. Thus, it is not realistic to expect that all students in a special program will exceed a particular percentile.

TEST SCORES

Although data on the numbers of students in particular scoring ranges were not required for this report, approximately half of the campuses provided this information. Basically, there are three categories of scores, those below the 23rd percentile, those between the 23rd and 40th percentile, and those above the 40th percentile. Any score below the

23rd percentile is always considered a low score, and any score above the 40th percentile is always a high score. However, for students exiting the special program, a score between the 23rd and 40th percentile is a low score, and for students remaining in the special program, the same percentile range represents a high score. This classification is based on the State Board of Education rules for exiting students from special language programs.

TABLE 14
PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH SCORES IN THE BILINGUAL AND ESL PROGRAMS

GRADE LEVEL	BILINGUAL		ESL	
	EXITING	REMAINING	EXITING	REMAINING
1	72	34	68	35
2	75	35	69	35
3	65	30	60	38
4	56	28	59	36
5	51	24	53	30
6	57	25	28	28
7			41	20
8			33	19
9			38	16
10			45	28
11			56	36

Generally, the percentage of bilingual and ESL students exiting the program with high scores are greater in the first through third grades. However, more ESL students with high scores remain in the program. These results do not necessarily mean that one program produces high scores. Rather, slightly different philosophies are in place regarding the achievement level to be attained before exiting students. It must be emphasized that these differences are quite small and represent little educational difference.

TEAMS Scores

The TEAMS is administered each year to students in odd-numbered grade levels through the ninth grade. In addition, an exit level test is administered starting in the eleventh grade to provide students several opportunities to pass this test, which is required for graduation. The TEAMS test generally covers basic skills and is a more specific test of selected competencies than general knowledge achievement tests. The next table presents the percentage of students passing the reading and mathematics sections of the test.

TABLE 15
PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RATED AS PASSING SECTIONS OF THE TEAMS TEST**

ENGLISH VERSION

GRADE LEVEL	READING			MATHEMATICS		
	BILINGUAL	ESL	NO SPECIAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM	BILINGUAL	ESL	NO SPECIAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM
1	61	61	80	80	81	88
3	40	49	82	71	73	87
5	45	45	85	64	65	87
7	(53)	43	85	(62)	56	86
9	(36)	33	81	(54)	52	84

TABLE 16
PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RATED AS MASTERING SECTIONS OF THE TEAMS TEST**

SPANISH VERSION

GRADE LEVEL	READING			MATHEMATICS		
	BILINGUAL	ESL	NEITHER*	BILINGUAL	ESL	NEITHER*
1	80	(55)	72	86	(76)	81
3	89	(65)	81	81	(72)	71

*NEITHER denotes students taking the Spanish version of the TEAMS who were not enrolled in a special language program

TABLE 17
PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RATED AS MASTERING SECTIONS OF THE TEAMS**
BY LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION

SPANISH VERSION

GRADE LEVEL	READING			MATHEMATICS		
	ENGLISH	SPANISH	BOTH*	ENGLISH	SPANISH	BOTH*
1	(73)	79	79	(87)	85	86
3	(67)	88	86	(75)	80	80

*BOTH denotes that students were instructed in English and Spanish

**From: *Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills, Student Performance Results 1987*, Volume I, Statewide and Regional Results.

The parentheses in Tables 15, 16, and 17 designate percentages based on small numbers of students which may not be adequately stable or representative. The tabled values for the English version of the TEAMS

demonstrate very little difference between the performance of students in either program. Students in these programs, however, do score lower on the English version of the TEAMS than those not enrolled in special language programs. This is expected, since these students are enrolled in the program as a result of demonstrated limited English proficiency. On the Spanish version of the TEAMS (Tables 16 and 17), bilingual student performance is similar to that of other students (not in special language programs) on the English version. However, direct contrasts between results on the two versions of TEAMS are not appropriate due to differences in content.

A variety of outcome measures presented for both special language programs indicate contrasting results. Table 18 summarizes the different performance measures used in this study. The measures are presented separately by grade level and program and include data from all campuses responding to the surveys.

TABLE 18
SUMMARIZATION OF PERFORMANCE CONTRASTS BETWEEN
TWO APPROACHES IN SPECIAL LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

GRADE	BILINGUAL				ESL			
LEVEL	%EXIT	%PRO	%NR	%HS	%EXIT	%PRO	%NR	%HS
K	20.7	90.6	25.7	76	26.1	82.0	20.7	61
1	20.8	75.3	23.8	72	35.0	69.5	17.9	68
2	25.6	80.4	28.2	75	38.1	76.8	18.4	69
3	28.1	81.6	32.5	65	35.6	76.0	24.0	60
4	24.2	80.5	34.7	56	33.0	73.1	28.5	59
5	22.9	80.0	38.5	51	29.2	76.1	34.6	53
6	23.2	78.2	42.5	57	32.4	80.5	27.7	28

%Exit = The percentage of students scheduled to be exited from the special language program.

%Pro = The percentage of students scheduled to be promoted to the next grade level.

%NR = The percentage of students who are to be exited from the special language program and are scheduled to receive some other form of compensatory service.

%HS = The percentage of students who are exiting the program and who are scoring above the 40th percentile.

It should be evident that, in some cases, bilingual programs appear to evidence superior outcomes, while in others ESL programs seem to have an advantage. As discussed earlier, there are significant demographic differences among campuses. In an attempt to clarify comparisons between the programs, a selection procedure was incorporated to obtain campuses that were more closely matched on district characteristics. However, any restrictions imposed reduced the numbers of campuses and

students. Specifically, it was impossible to perfectly match campuses, while maintaining a sufficient number of students to ensure the stability of the data. Accordingly, compromises were required in the selection and numbers of control variables. The variables selected were the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch and the size of the district. In order to obtain a reasonable number of students and campuses, the restriction consisted of using only campuses with more than 80 percent of the students eligible for free/reduced price lunch which were in districts with less than 25,000 ADA. The resulting comparisons are presented in Table 19.

TABLE 19
SUMMARIZATION OF PERFORMANCE CONTRASTS BETWEEN TWO APPROACHES IN SPECIAL LANGUAGE PROGRAMS WITH RESTRICTION ON CAMPUS TYPE

GRADE LEVEL	BILINGUAL				ESL			
	%EXIT	%PRO	%NR	%HS	%EXIT	%PRO	%NR	%HS
K	13	91	59	78	21	90	23	60
1	15	81	38	73	28	78	22	65
2	24	90	38	71	27	85	26	56
3	23	87	35	63	25	84	18	-
4	20	79	51	53	19	83	35	-
5	20	74	47	56	22	74	39	-
6	19	72	53	62	31	81	-	-

No data are presented for ESL students with high scores in grades 3 - 6 due to very small numbers of students. The lack of data may be due to the fact that the numbers of students with high scores was an optional reporting item for this study. The remainder of the comparisons are considered to be reasonably stable.

Generally, by restricting the sample to the higher percentage of free/reduced price lunch students and to campuses from smaller districts, exit rates declined, promotion rates increased slightly, the percentage needing additional remediation increased, and scores stayed nearly the same. It should be noted that these effects were not consistent between programs or among grade levels. It is clear that, even with these restrictions, ESL programs generally have higher exit rates and less need for remediation, but bilingual programs have higher promotion rates and higher percentages of students in the top scoring bracket.

STUDENT INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

As in the Campus section, student-level findings are divided into description and performance portions. While the intent of the campus data collection was to obtain information from every campus offering a special language program, individual student data were collected for a sample of students from districts offering these programs. This sample will be described below to delineate the sample population and to provide perspective for the purpose of interpreting the findings. As noted earlier, this sample of students was not specifically intended to be representative of the general special language student population. Rather, it was to be composed of bilingual and ESL students who were good examples of either successes or failures. This sampling goal was reasonably accomplished. Moreover, the sample allows generalization of the findings to the population of special language students as a whole.

DESCRIPTION

District Information

As discussed in the Evaluation Strategy chapter, each student questionnaire included a code that allowed general identification of district size, percent minority, wealth, and geographic region. This code was purposefully constructed to be less specific than those used in the Agency Analyze procedure in order to ensure district anonymity. (More information on these codes may be found in Appendix A.) Table 20 contains the frequencies obtained from the sample for each district category included in the code. As shown in Table 20, the percentage of students in the sample is somewhat unevenly distributed across ADA categories. However, because this is a student-based study with specific student demographics and individual instructional methodologies, district characteristics are not critical to the analyses. Nearly 64 percent of the special language students are from districts with minority student populations greater than 37 percent. In addition, 28 percent are from Super Region 1 which is composed of districts extending from the Rio Grande Valley to San Antonio. Fairly uniform percentages were obtained across the three wealth categories used on the student questionnaire.

TABLE 20
NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN SAMPLE
WITHIN PARTICULAR DISTRICT CATEGORIES

ADA	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS*
>25,000	378	18.9
10,000 -24,999	581	29.1
5,000 - 9,999	197	9.9
3,000 - 4,999	236	11.8
1,000 - 2,999	385	19.3
<1,000	220	11.0
Not Indicated	128	
PERCENT MINORITY	**NUMBER OF STUDENTS**	**PERCENT OF STUDENTS**
<13.5	200	10.0
13.5 to 37.4	521	26.2
>37.4	1,271	63.8
Not Indicated	133	
WEALTH PER STUDENT	**NUMBER OF STUDENTS**	**PERCENT OF STUDENTS**
<$135,042	582	29.2
$135,042-$246,052	807	40.5
>$246,052	603	30.3
Not Indicated	133	
GEOGRAPHIC AREA	**NUMBER OF STUDENTS**	**PERCENT OF STUDENTS**
Super Region 1	561	28.1
Super Region 2	386	19.3
Super Region 3	419	21.0
Super Region 4	235	11.8
Super Region 5	396	19.8
Not Indicated		

* Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Student Information

Although the student demographic variables will be examined in more depth in the discussion of performance data, the number and percentage of students within selected categories are presented for review. Table 21, as with the remainder of tables in this section, will have differing total numbers of students as a result of lack of response to specific items on individual student questionnaires. Two of the categories in Table 21, dual service and free/reduced price lunch, are similar to the categories presented in the campus section. The overall percentage of students in this sample who receive dual service is 41.6 percent, which can be contrasted to the campus-based finding of 65 percent. This difference may be due to the differences in responses across ADA categories between the campus data and student data, since larger

districts tend to have higher percentages of students needing some type of compensatory service. The high percentage (more than 80 percent) of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch from the student-based data is similar to that found in the campus-based data (85.1 percent). A slight majority (52.2 percent) of the sample was male and a vast majority (81.6 percent) had been in the district two or more years. Similarly, 86 percent of the students in the sample had not been classified migrant during the last five years.

TABLE 21
NUMBERS OF STUDENTS IN VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHIC CATEGORIES

GRADE LEVEL	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS*
1	573	28.6
3	484	24.2
5	353	17.6
7	132	6.6
9	64	3.2
11	104	5.2
Other**	291	14.6
Not Indicated	124	

SEX	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
Male	1,020	52.2
Female	933	47.8

MIGRANT	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
Yes	290	14.0
No	1,775	86.0

YEARS IN DISTRICT	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
<1	94	4.5
1	294	13.9
2-3	1,052	49.9
4-5	415	19.7
6 or more	254	12.0

DUAL SERVICE	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
Yes	872	41.6
No	1,225	58.4

FREE/REDUCED PRICE LUNCH	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
Yes	1,708	81.9
No	378	18.1

* Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding.

** Although students were requested from odd-number grade levels, "Other" represents students from even-numbered grade levels, mostly grades two and four.

Table 21 is presented for students in both types of special language programs. For the remainder of this section, however, most tables will present data separately for bilingual and ESL programs in grade levels K - 6 and for ESL programs in grades 7 - 12. Because there were so few students included in the sample who were enrolled in bilingual programs

in higher grade levels, this group was not included in the analyses. Table 22 presents the number and percentage of students in the bilingual and ESL programs and those no longer being served.

TABLE 22
PERCENT OF STUDENTS IN THE BILINGUAL AND ESL PROGRAM

PROGRAM	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
Bilingual	918	43.2
ESL	971	45.7
No Longer Served	236	11.1

Before presenting the results of the performance analyses, a description of the performance and composite measures used in the analyses will be provided.

PERFORMANCE

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

As discussed earlier, performance and thus success can be assessed using many different outcome measures. It was the intent of this study to collect both subjective and objective measures of success. To that end, each district's contact person was asked to select students according to various criteria including Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) performance, promotion/retention, and subjective ratings of success and nonsuccess using local criteria. It was assumed that these student selections, regardless of guidelines, would be considered subjective classifications. In addition to this selection, various objective measures, such as achievement and TEAMS test scores, were collected in order to construct an objective measure of success.

The use of multiple outcome measures in a single relational equation, although often employed, is complicated both in analysis and explanation. An alternative approach is to construct a composite measure which can be examined as it relates to various educational variables such as student demographics and instructional strategies. The intention of the study was to use both a multiple outcome and a composite measure for data analysis, but the final selection of data to be analyzed was deferred until the preliminary analysis of the questionnaires was accomplished. This strategy was necessary because the availability of specific information (some of which would be two years old) was not established.

In order to obtain the broadest possible perspective, the following performance measures were requested for each student:

- English achievement percentile 1986
- English achievement percentile 1987
- 1985 Texas Assessment of Basic Skills percent reading objectives passed
- 1985 Texas Assessment of Basic Skills percent mathematics objectives passed
- 1987 TEAMS percent reading objectives passed
- 1987 TEAMS percent mathematics objectives passed
- English reading grade level
- Promotion/retention/placement
- Essential element mastery in language arts
- Essential element mastery in mathematics
- Essential element mastery in science
- Essential element mastery in social studies
- Percent of time in native language usage
- Increases in oral language proficiency
- Spanish achievement testing

A factor analysis was performed to determine the interrelationships among these outcome variables. In order to simplify the presentation of results, a composite score was constructed to include the various factors evident in the data using the results from the PROC FACTOR procedure of the SAS analysis package. This procedure was conducted

separately for bilingual and ESL students to examine possible differences in outcomes between the programs.

For both bilingual and ESL students, the same four factors were identified. Although the first factor was somewhat general, the strongest loadings on the first factor were for the number of objectives passed on the three subtests of TEAMS. The next factor clearly related to the percentage of time that students use their native language in the classroom. Percentile range on the 1985-86 English achievement test loaded highest on the third factor and a variety of measures loaded moderately on the fourth factor.

Additional analyses indicated a substantial intercorrelation between the various measures of essential element mastery. In other words, students who do well in language arts also tend to do well on the other three measures of essential element mastery. Likewise, correlations of performance within the TEAMS subtests were quite large. It was thus considered that the use of only the reading portion of the TEAMS and Texas Assessment of Basic Skills and the essential element mastery for language arts would not substantially reduce the quality of information available on individual students. Elimination of the somewhat redundant measures from the analyses was expected to simplify the presentation of results. Data on all measures collected are available on data tapes for the researcher interested in pursuing more detailed relationships among these variables.

In determining the composite success measure to be used in the analyses, increased achievement was assumed to be one of the goals of the programs. Accordingly, current and previous achievement test percentile standings and performance on basic skills tests were additional variables to be included in the measure. Furthermore, both current achievement level and a measure of change were included, because exit from the programs is also tied to specific achievement levels. The change measure was initially defined as the change in the number of objectives mastered from the 1985 Texas Assessment of Basic Skills to the 1986-87 TEAMS test. However, data from the 1985-86 Texas Assessment of Basic Skills test was unavailable for a large portion of the sample. As a result, the change measure was defined as the difference between 1987 and 1986 achievement tests. The measure of current performance was defined as the percentage of objectives mastered on the 1986-87 TEAMS test. The 1986-87 achievement test percentile standing would have been preferred as the measure of current achievement. However, since both the TEAMS test and the English achievement test measure "achievement", this alternative was not expected to introduce substantial error. Furthermore, a composite score was computed using the achievement test score as the current achievement measure and change from Texas Assessment of Basic Skills performance to TEAMS performance as the change measure, although the numbers of students were very low. A correlation of .91 was found between the two measures, indicating that the use of the alternative method should produce similar results. Moreover, the alternative method included many more students and, therefore, more effectively detects differences among the variables of interest.

The values assigned to the selected levels of the outcome variables are presented in Table 23. Values for each of the variables were added for each student to construct composite scores. These scores ranged in value from 6 to 12. The distribution of the scores was reviewed and a range of values was selected to classify "successful" and "nonsuccessful" students. Approximately 50 percent of the students fell into each category. Remembering that the purpose is to identify particular associates of success, rather than specific students, the selection of any reasonable value should enable these computations.

TABLE 23
VALUES OF VARIABLES COMPOSING COMPUTED SUCCESS MEASURE

VARIABLE	DESCRIPTION	VALUE
TEAMS	More than 60 percent objectives mastered	1
	Fewer than 60 percent objectives mastered	2
Achievement Change*	Greater or same percentile	1
	Percentile loss	2
Promotion	Promoted	1
	Retained or placed	2
Grade level	Above or on grade level	1
	Below grade level	2
Essential Elements	Mastered elements	1
	Did not master elements	2
Native Language	Using less at end of year	1
	Using same or more at end of year	2

* Student performance on TEAMS, Texas Assessment of Basic Skills, and achievement tests was not reported as an actual raw score but as a score within one of five categories.

Discussion of results will be divided into seven presentation blocks which represent various categories from the questionnaire. Not all questionnaire items were included, however, in order to reduce the presentation to a more manageable size. Obviously, these data have the potential for multiple analyses from quite divergent viewpoints. The reader is reminded that tapes containing these data are available from the Agency for independent analysis.

The contents of the blocks selected for the analyses are as follows:

BLOCK 1: Student Performance (results used in remaining blocks)
BLOCK 2: Student Demographics (results used in remaining blocks)
BLOCK 3: District Demographics
BLOCK 4: General Program Characteristics
BLOCK 5: Specific Instructional Strategies
BLOCK 6: Teacher Variables
BLOCK 7: Parent Variables

BLOCK 1: Student Performance

The data presented in Table 24 are the number and percentage of students in the sample scoring in various categories of the selected performance measures. Detailed examination of these data will be presented in the sections to follow. As noted earlier, some of the measures presented in the following table will not be incorporated into the discussion in order to reduce the volume of the information to be considered.

TABLE 24
DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE ON SELECTED TEST MEASURES

A. 1985 TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF BASIC SKILLS READING OBJECTIVES MASTERED

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
PERCENTAGE	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS*	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS*
>80	41	17.4	42	14.3
60-79	47	19.9	55	18.7
40-59	34	14.4	69	23.5
20-39	53	22.5	58	19.7
<20	61	25.8	70	23.8

B. 1985 TEXAS ASSESSMENT OF BASIC SKILLS MATHEMATICS OBJECTIVES MASTERED

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
PERCENTAGE	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
>80	60	27.1	68	22.7
60-79	58	26.2	82	27.4
40-59	35	15.8	58	19.4
20-39	31	14.0	46	15.4
<20	37	16.7	45	15.1

C. 1987 TEAMS READING OBJECTIVES MASTERED

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
PERCENTAGE	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
>80	258	36.2	133	22.5
60-79	112	15.7	152	25.7
40-59	118	16.6	115	19.4
20-39	103	14.5	88	14.9
<20	121	17.0	104	17.6

D. 1987 TEAMS MATHEMATICS OBJECTIVES MASTERED

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
PERCENTAGE	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
>80	377	53.6	232	39.5
60-79	121	17.2	140	23.9
40-59	86	12.2	77	13.1
20-39	55	7.8	81	13.8
<20	65	9.2	57	9.7

E. 1986 ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT TEST PERCENTILE STANDINGS

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
PERCENTAGE	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
>80th %ile	26	4.4	20	3.3
60-79th %ile	42	7.1	29	4.8
40-59th %ile	71	12.0	75	12.4
20-39th %ile	175	29.5	161	26.7
<20th %ile	280	47.1	319	52.8

F. 1987 ENGLISH ACHIEVEMENT TEST PERCENTILE STANDINGS

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
PERCENTAGE	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
>80th %ile	35	4.9	27	3.6
60-79th %ile	70	9.9	56	7.4
40-59th %ile	124	17.5	137	18.1
20-39th %ile	216	30.5	209	27.5
<20th %ile	263	37.1	330	43.5

G. 1987 SPANISH ACHIEVEMENT TEST PERCENTILE STANDINGS

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
PERCENTAGE	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
80%th ile	49	23.4	18	17.1
60-79th %ile	28	13.4	9	8.6
40-59th %ile	37	17.7	18	17.1
20-39th %ile	42	20.1	24	22.9
<20th %ile	53	25.4	36	34.3

* Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Table 24 parts A and C (likewise B and D) indicate that there are substantial differences in the distributions of the scores. For both bilingual and ESL students, the percentage of students in the lower

performance brackets decreases notably over the two-year interval. Since this sample purposely includes both nonsuccessful and successful students, this gain is particularly encouraging and demonstrates a substantive impact for these programs. Although a similar trend appears in the percentage of students in the lower performance brackets of the English achievement tests (parts E and F), the gain in the higher performance brackets is small.

Distributions of scores on a Spanish achievement test are shown in part G. The numbers of students in these categories are quite small and may not be indicative of the performance of special language students in general. Considering this limitation, the distributions of scores are somewhat higher than those for the English achievement tests. However, this does not necessarily indicate that special language students perform better on a Spanish achievement test than on an English achievement test. Further, serious consideration must be given to the question of comparability of content as well as norming procedures between achievement tests constructed in two different languages.

It should be noted that the distributions in Table 24 are not based on matched students, and in some cases, the numbers of students included in the categories are small. It is also necessary to understand that these distributions are based on categorical data with each "block" representing an additional 20 percent mastery and 20 percentile points. It requires an average change of approximately 10 raw score points to move from one block to another. Although these measures would be expected to be relatively insensitive to changes in performance, the table below indicates the percentages of students moving from one category to another are not low.

TABLE 25
PERCENT OF STUDENTS CHANGING FROM ONE ENGLISH
ACHIEVEMENT TEST PERFORMANCE CATEGORY TO ANOTHER

The table values are the percentages of students within each category of subjective success who either stayed the same, gained a performance level, or lost a level.

		CHANGE IN ACHIEVEMENT PERFORMANCE CATEGORY		
PROGRAM	SUCCESS	SAME LEVEL	GAINED LEVEL	LOST LEVEL
Bilingual	Yes	46.1	38.0	15.9
	No	64.3	17.2	18.6
ESL	Yes	43.8	38.8	17.4
	No	54.8	29.4	15.9

In general, approximately half of the students rated successful demonstrated a change in performance level. Again, the differences between successful students in bilingual and ESL programs are small. One noteworthy finding is that a slightly higher percentage of nonsuccessful ESL students gained a performance level.

The next table contains additional performance measures. These indicators of success are generally considered to incorporate a mixture of objective (local or teacher-made test performance) and subjective (demonstration of skill) measures.

TABLE 26
DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS, PROMOTION, ENGLISH READING GRADE LEVEL, AND ORAL LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

A. ESSENTIAL ELEMENT MASTERY: LANGUAGE ARTS

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
MASTERED?	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS*	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS*
Yes	486	54.1	467	49.9
No	413	45.9	468	50.1

B. ESSENTIAL ELEMENT MASTERY: MATHEMATICS

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
MASTERED?	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
Yes	629	69.9	648	69.9
No	271	30.1	279	30.1

C. ESSENTIAL ELEMENT MASTERY: SCIENCE

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
MASTERED?	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
Yes	579	64.8	561	61.1
No	315	35.2	357	38.9

D. ESSENTIAL ELEMENT MASTERY: SOCIAL STUDIES

	BILINGUAL		ESL	
MASTERED?	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS
Yes	602	67.3	582	63.7
No	292	32.7	332	36.3

E. PROMOTION/RETENTION/PLACEMENT

ACTION	BILINGUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	BILINGUAL PERCENT OF STUDENTS	ESL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	ESL PERCENT OF STUDENTS
Promoted	596	66.7	676	71.2
Retained	152	17.0	136	14.3
Placed	145	16.2	137	14.4

F. ENGLISH READING LEVEL

LEVEL	BILINGUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	BILINGUAL PERCENT OF STUDENTS	ESL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	ESL PERCENT OF STUDENTS
On grade level	308	35.5	285	30.2
Above grade level	28	3.2	28	3.0
Below grade level	531	61.2	630	66.8

G. GAIN IN ORAL LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

MEASURE	BILINGUAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	BILINGUAL PERCENT OF STUDENTS	ESL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	ESL PERCENT OF STUDENTS
Objective	117	13.1	79	8.3
Subjective	160	17.9	188	19.7
Objective & Subjective	577	64.5	637	66.8
No Gain	40	4.5	49	5.1

As shown in Table 26, approximately half of the bilingual and ESL students were rated by teachers as having mastered the essential elements in language arts. Approximately 70 percent in each program mastered the mathematics essential elements and for science and social studies the values were above 60 percent for both groups. Again, it should be realized that these data are based on purposive sampling to include successful and nonsuccessful students. The finding that nearly half of the students mastered the language arts essential elements on grade level is not surprising. The relatively higher percentage of mastery of the mathematics essential elements is in keeping with the assumption that these elements are somewhat language independent. The finding that higher percentages of students were mastering the essential elements in science and social students was somewhat unexpected given the high skill levels of reading/language arts in these subject areas.

The relative percentages of students are comparable between bilingual and ESL programs across promotion, retention, and placement as well as English reading level categories. In addition, a majority of students in both programs are considered below grade level in English reading (part F), although a majority in both programs exhibit large gains in oral language proficiency as measured both objectively and subjectively. Most importantly, these similarities allow some comparisons to be made between the programs.

BLOCK 2: Student Variables

This presentation block examines various student background variables as they relate to success. Regression analyses were conducted with subjective and objective success considered separately as the dependent (predicted) variable and student background variables as the independent (predictor) variables. Only those variables significantly associated with success in the regression models will be examined in detail. The results of the regression analyses for the student variables are presented in Tables 27, 28, and 29.

TABLE 27
BILINGUAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR STUDENT VARIABLES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE SUCCESS

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	14	5.426	0.0001		
ERROR	481			R-SQUARE	0.1364

B: OBJECTIVE SUCCESS

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	14	1.574	0.0869		
ERROR	250			R-SQUARE	0.0810

VARIABLE	SUBJECTIVE PARAMETER	SUBJECTIVE PROB >[T]	OBJECTIVE PARAMETER	OBJECTIVE PROB >[T]
Intercept	1.646	0.0001	9.228	0.0001
Number years in district	-0.034	0.3454	-0.154	0.4077
Schooled in native country	0.096	0.0048	0.235	0.1329
Number schools last 5 years	-0.025	0.4845	-0.002	0.9901
Classified migrant last 5 yrs	-0.065	0.3368	0.045	0.8857
Eligibility for F/RPL*	-0.088	0.3224	-0.113	0.7499
Times retained	0.183	0.0001	0.551	0.0026
Years in spec language progs	0.024	0.3439	0.132	0.2633
Times reentered programs	-0.042	0.5351	-0.165	0.6042
LEP status when first placed	0.001	0.9860	-0.074	0.0739
% time nat lang begin 86-87	-0.047	0.0034	0.016	0.8260
Days missed in 86-87	0.060	0.0086	-0.027	0.8071
Serious behavior problems	-0.154	0.0932	-0.539	0.2342
Formal assmnt learning style	0.051	0.2759	-0.096	0.6552
Organized extracurricular	-0.068	0.0249	-0.120	0.3847

* free/reduced price lunch

TABLE 28
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR STUDENT VARIABLES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE SUCCESS

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	14	1.927	0.0235		
ERROR	293			R-SQUARE	0.0843

B: OBJECTIVE SUCCESS

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	14	1.059	0.4035		
ERROR	103			R-SQUARE	0.1258

	SUBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE	
VARIABLE	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|
Intercept	1.714	0.0001	7.220	0.0020
Number years in district	-0.029	0.5418	-0.035	0.8875
Schooled in native country	-0.018	0.6623	-0.216	0.3360
Number schools last 5 years	-0.076	0.0804	0.002	0.9940
Classified migrant last 5 yrs	-0.050	0.5245	0.228	0.5895
Eligibility for F/RPL*	0.018	0.7651	0.237	0.5137
Times retained	0.190	0.0003	0.497	0.0747
Years in spec language progs	0.009	0.7977	-0.143	0.3944
Times reentered programs	0.128	0.1476	0.300	0.5865
LEP status when first placed	0.002	0.8297	-0.020	0.6932
% time nat lang begin 86-87	0.002	0.9279	0.037	0.7891
Days missed in 86-87	0.038	0.2221	0.283	0.0757
Serious behavior problems	-0.171	0.2725	-0.008	0.9922
Formal assmnt learning style	-0.107	0.0871	-0.081	0.7782
Organized extracurricular	-0.030	0.3930	0.043	0.8941

* free/reduced price lunch

TABLE 29
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR STUDENT VARIABLES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 7-12

A: SUBJECTIVE SUCCESS

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	14	3.594	0.0001		
ERROR	160			R-SQUARE	0.2392

B: OBJECTIVE SUCCESS

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	14	1.405	0.1696		
ERROR	82			R-SQUARE	0.1935

VARIABLE	SUBJECTIVE PARAMETER	SUBJECTIVE PROB >[T]	OBJECTIVE PARAMETER	OBJECTIVE PROB >[T]
Intercept	0.943	0.0545	9.081	0.0001
Number years in district	0.048	0.2715	0.153	0.4170
Schooled in native country	0.001	0.9815	-0.127	0.6031
Number schools last 5 years	-0.003	0.9465	-0.170	0.4904
Classified migrant last 5 yrs	-0.142	0.1258	0.147	0.7011
Eligibility for F/RPL*	0.078	0.3496	-0.615	0.1052
Times retained	0.208	0.0001	0.290	0.2047
Years in spec language progs	-0.023	0.5279	0.037	0.7974
Times reentered programs	0.143	0.2124	-0.128	0.8077
LEP status when first placed	0.017	0.2849	0.049	0.4412
% time nat lang begin 86-87	-0.058	0.0313	-0.033	0.7853
Days missed in 86-87	0.082	0.0491	0.257	0.1545
Serious behavior problems	-0.036	0.8128	-0.493	0.4583
Formal assmnt learning style	0.016	0.8395	0.078	0.8139
Organized extracurricular	-0.019	0.6730	-0.040	0.8538

* free/reduced price lunch

All three of the models are highly significant in predicting subjective success but not objective success. This significance is seen by examining the tabled "F" value and comparing the probability of this value to the preselected value of .05. Probabilities less than .05 will be considered significant with some consideration given to "marginally" significant variables below the .10 level.

NOTE: In general the term "variance accounted for" is used to give an estimate of the ability to "account for" evidenced performance. In seeking to understand a particular aspect of human behavior, researchers attempt to predict (or estimate) some measure of performance (the dependent or criterion variable) from other measures (the predictor variables) believed to be related to that performance. Both the criterion and predictor variables will vary across a range of

values. The extent to which they vary with one another, or covary, is calculated using linear regression and is described by a value called R-square. R-square varies between 0 and 1, with higher values indicating that a greater portion of the variation in the criterion measure is attributable to the predictor variables. In other words, the higher the R-square, the stronger the relationship between the criterion variable and the predictor variables. Again, the reader is cautioned about making causal inferences on the basis of relational (correlation) data.

Statistics presented for the predictor variables include parameter estimates and probability values. The value of the parameter estimate itself is of little consequence given differences in scaling among the variables. The sign of the estimate is critical and is interpreted by examining the meaning of the value of the predictor variables. The direction of the relationship will be interpreted during the discussions. Note that the intercept is a "constant" and will usually be significant but is not useful to the purposes of this study.

Mobility/Tenure

Results of these regression analyses indicated that in no case was the number of schools attended in the last five years, or the number of years in the district, a significant predictor of success. Additionally, whether the student had been classified a migrant in the last five years was not a significant predictor. Examination of the distributions of these variables indicated that there were occurrences of students in each of the mobility categories. However, the category of six or more schools attended in the last five years had less than 1 percent of the students. Although high mobility, both within the district and between districts, has often been cited as contributing to low student performance, this relationship was not evident in this study.

Schooled in the Native Country

Questions 4 on the student data collection instrument was as follows: If the student is an immigrant, did the student receive schooling in the native country? This variable was statistically related to subjective success in bilingual programs in grades 1 - 6. In the case where the student had been schooled in the native country, there was almost twice the likelihood that the student would be perceived successful. This result is consistent with the hypothesis that a solid knowledge base is important to continued success in schooling as well as to the students' full participation in the educational process while learning English. However, this relationship was neither statistically supported when objective performance was considered nor when considering either measure of success in the ESL program.

TABLE 30
DISTRIBUTION OF SUCCESSFUL RATED STUDENTS IN THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM BY SCHOOLING IN THE NATIVE COUNTRY

RECEIVED SCHOOLING?	SUCCESS/NONSUCCESS	
Yes	Success	66%
	NonSuccess	34%
No	Success	52%
	NonSuccess	48%
Unknown	Success	45%
	NonSuccess	55%

Free/Reduced Price Lunch

There was no relationship between eligibility for the free/reduced price lunch program and success in any of the six models. When score distributions were examined, it was evident that there was a slight, but nonsignificant, trend for students eligible for free/reduced price lunch to score at lower levels on both the TEAMS and achievement tests. However, the difference between the percentage of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch varied by less than 10 percent from the highest to the lowest performance levels.

Retention

In all of the regression models examining subjective success and student variables there was a statistically significant relationship between the number of times the student had been retained during the academic career and subjective success. As discussed in the campus section, retention does not appear to be a practice supported by empirical data. The next table presents the percentage of students rated successful by number of retentions. The percentage of students rated nonsuccessful in each of these categories of retention is calculated by subtracting the value shown in the table from 100. Table 31 indicates that more than 50 percent of the students who have never been retained in grades 1 - 6 are (both subjectively and objectively) rated successful. In terms of subjective ratings, there is roughly a 2:1 probability of being viewed successful. Note that after only one retention this ratio declines so that there is a greater probability of being rated nonsuccessful than successful. The same pattern is evident regarding subjective success for ESL students in grades 7 - 12.

TABLE 31
PERCENT OF STUDENTS RATED SUCCESSFUL BY NUMBER OF RETENTIONS

GRADES 1-6

SUCCESS TYPE (BILINGUAL)	NUMBER OF RETENTIONS 0	1	2	3
Subjective	65%	37%	30%	0%
Objective	57%	37%	25%	0%

SUCCESS TYPE (ESL)	NUMBER OF RETENTIONS 0	1	2	3
Subjective	69%	45%	26%	0%
Objective	54%	39%	0%	0%

GRADES 7-12

SUCCESS TYPE (ESL)	NUMBER OF RETENTIONS 0	1	2	3
Subjective	78%	46%	43%	20%
Objective	36%	31%	45%	0%

Years in Program/Times Re-entered/Initial LEP Status

Interestingly, there was no statistically significant relationship between any of these variables and either subjective or objective success. Thus, the data from this study do not provide further insight into the relationship between length of program participation and performance. It is somewhat encouraging that initial LEP status is not predictive of success, since low initial performance does not appear to be a detriment to eventual success.

Percent of Time in Native Language

This measure is somewhat collinear with the objective measure of success because it is one of the variables used in the change measure of oral language usage. However, it was included in these models to determine whether the student's initial proficiency was statistically significant in predicting success. However, none of the models predicting objective success were statistically significant. For bilingual students in grades 1 - 6, this variable was predictive of subjective success. In general, the greater the native language usage, the less the chance of being rated successful. For students using their native language more than 80 percent of the time at the beginning of the year, only 44 percent were rated successful. For students using their native language less than 20 percent of the time in the classroom, 62 percent were rated successful. Thus, it appears that students who use their native language less in the classroom are more likely to be rated successful in bilingual programs for grades 1 - 6. There was a tendency to rate older

ESL students who used the native language less at the beginning of the year subjectively successful, although the relationship was not linear.

TABLE 32
PERCENT OF STUDENTS RATED SUCCESSFUL BY PERCENT OF TIME USING NATIVE LANGUAGE IN CLASSROOM

Tabled value is percent of students rated subjectively successful.

	BILINGUAL GRADES 1-6	ESL GRADES 7-12
>80%	44	62
60-79%	56	56
40-59%	50	60
20-39%	67	71
<20%	62	65

Absences

Question 40 on the data collection instrument asked: For the 1986-87 school year, what was the number of days this student missed (excused and unexcused)? This variable was statistically significant in predicting subjective success in bilingual programs for grades 1 - 6 and in ESL programs for grades 7 - 12. In both groups, lower absence rates were associated with higher percentages of success and higher absence rates with lower percentages of success.

TABLE 33
PERCENT OF STUDENTS RATED SUCCESSFUL BY NUMBER OF ABSENCES

Tabled value is percent of students rated subjectively successful.

NUMBER OF DAYS MISSED	BILINGUAL GRADES 1-6	ESL GRADES 7-12
Not Absent	63	76
1-5	61	73
6-10	52	61
11-20	38	48
21 Or More	38	5

Extracurricular Activities

There is a statistically significant relationship between participation in extracurricular activities and subjective success for bilingual students in grades 1 - 6. For the student involved in one or more extracurricular activities, there is a greater likelihood of being rated successful than for those not participating. However, it should be

noted that 78 percent of this group of students were not involved in any extracurricular activity.

TABLE 34
PERCENT OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS RATED SUCCESSFUL BY NUMBER OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

	NUMBER OF EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES				
	0	1	2	3	4 OR MORE
Percent Subjectively Successful	51	70	63	69	67

Need For Continuing Support

Question 42 on the data collection instrument asked: How likely do you think it is that this student will drop out of school without continued support from some form of remedial/compensatory program throughout school? Although not included in the regression equations, ratings were obtained regarding the student's eventual need for support and potential for dropping out of school. The results from these questions are quite similar for both bilingual and ESL programs. As shown in Table 35, teachers indicated that 28 percent of the students will continue to need significant intervention and that approximately 4 percent will drop out in any case. It is interesting to note that some estimates of Hispanic drop-out rates are similar to the percentage noted as dropping out in any case in addition to those needing significant intervention. It might be hypothesized that significant intervention may not be available in most cases to prevent these high risk students from dropping out of school.

TABLE 35
PERCENT OF STUDENTS NEEDING INDICATED LEVELS OF INTERVENTION

	INTERVENTION LEVEL				
PROGRAM TYPE	HELP NOT NEEDED	NEED 1-2 YEARS	OCCASIONAL HELP	SIGNIFICANT INTERVENTION	WILL DROP OUT
Bilingual	28	24	16	28	3
ESL	26	27	16	26	4

BLOCK 3: District Demographics

The next tables contain the results of the regression analyses examining the two measures of success in relation to the district demographic variables derived from the general codes used in the student questionnaires.

TABLE 36
BILINGUAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHIC
PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	0.947	0.4360		
ERROR	777			R-SQUARE	0.0049

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	0.984	0.4162		
ERROR	377			R-SQUARE	0.0103

VARIABLE	SUBJECTIVE PARAMETER	SUBJECTIVE PROB >[T]	OBJECTIVE PARAMETER	OBJECTIVE PROB >[T]
Intercept	1.634	0.0001	8.844	0.0001
Super Region Category	0.001	0.9483	-0.099	0.0787
Refined ADA Category	0.009	0.4694	0.008	0.8868
Percent Minority Category	-0.050	0.2548	-0.075	0.7329
Wealth Category	-0.039	0.1086	0.100	0.3723

TABLE 37
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHIC
PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	1.132	0.3407		
ERROR	531			R-SQUARE	0.0085

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	2.147	0.0763		
ERROR	202			R-SQUARE	0.0408

	SUBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE	
VARIABLE	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|
Intercept	1.512	0.0001	8.306	0.0001
Super Region Category	0.017	0.2875	0.145	0.0472
Refined ADA Category	0.002	0.8497	-0.014	0.8049
Percent Minority Category	-0.023	0.4080	0.240	0.1228
Wealth Category	-0.046	0.1274	-0.213	0.1492

TABLE 38
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHIC
PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 7-12

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	1.809	0.1273		
ERROR	281			R-SQUARE	0.0251

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	1.575	0.1843		
ERROR	140			R-SQUARE	0.0431

	SUBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE	
VARIABLE	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|
Intercept	1.104	0.0001	9.848	0.0001
Super Region Category	0.021	0.3613	0.063	0.4864
Refined ADA Category	0.039	0.0644	0.057	0.5400
Percent Minority Category	0.018	0.6695	-0.379	0.0407
Wealth Category	-0.003	0.9425	-0.181	0.3342

Although none of the models are significant, there is a significant relationship between super region and objective success for ESL students. It is suspected that the small differences between the regions will not interfere with the goals of this student-based study. In fact, the presence of this relationship is quite close to the relationship of 1 out of 20 expected on a random basis with a preselected .05 level of significance.

BLOCK 4: General Program Characteristics

This presentation block will consider general program characteristics associated with success with the next three tables containing the results of the regression analyses.

TABLE 39
BILINGUAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR GENERAL PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS
PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	9	4.946	0.0001		
ERROR	524			R-SQUARE	0.0783

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	9	4.154	0.0001		
ERROR	276			R-SQUARE	0.1193

	SUBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE	
VARIABLE	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|
Intercept	2.086	0.0001	10.866	0.0001
Dual Service	-0.178	0.0001	-0.844	0.0001
#Reg English Only Classes/Day	-0.033	0.0402	-0.084	0.2109
#Eng Only Red/Modified Contnt	0.027	0.0508	0.172	0.0044
#Classes/Day W/ Native Lang	0.003	0.8384	-0.024	0.7055
%Time Nat Lang in Class	0.014	0.4875	-0.073	0.4332
%Time Teacher Nat Lang Beg86	0.032	0.1575	0.265	0.0149
%Time Teacher Nat Lang End87	-0.092	0.0007	-0.371	0.0019
Size Special Lang Classroom	-0.019	0.3965	-0.199	0.0415
Size of Regular Classroom	-0.025	0.2738	0.089	0.3656

TABLE 40
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR GENERAL PROGRAM
CHARACTERISTICS PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	9	1.085	0.3759		
ERROR	178			R-SQUARE	0.0520

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	9	1.026	0.4302		
ERROR	61			R-SQUARE	0.1315

VARIABLE	SUBJECTIVE PARAMETER	SUBJECTIVE PROB >[T]	OBJECTIVE PARAMETER	OBJECTIVE PROB >[T]
Intercept	2.206	0.0001	10.216	0.0001
Dual Service	-0.102	0.1691	-0.139	0.7200
#Reg English Only Classes/Day	-0.025	0.4470	0.251	0.1155
#Eng Only Red/Modified Contnt	0.008	0.7427	0.250	0.0857
#Classes/Day W/ Native Lang	-0.070	0.0562	-0.064	0.6653
%Time Nat Lang in Class	-0.006	0.8893	0.025	0.9021
%Time Teacher Nat Lang Beg86	-0.043	0.3391	-0.100	0.6712
%Time Teacher Nat Lang End87	-0.021	0.7351	-0.370	0.1771
Size Special Lang Classroom	-0.024	0.5715	-0.216	0.2556
Size of Regular Classroom	-0.028	0.5363	-0.029	0.8891

TABLE 41
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR GENERAL PROGRAM
CHARACTERISTICS PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 7-12

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	9	1.270	0.2601		
ERROR	116			R-SQUARE	0.0897

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	9	3.194	0.0029		
ERROR	68			R-SQUARE	0.2971

VARIABLE	SUBJECTIVE PARAMETER	SUBJECTIVE PROB >[T]	OBJECTIVE PARAMETER	OBJECTIVE PROB >[T]
Intercept	1.323	0.0029	12.521	0.0001
Dual Service	0.055	0.5555	-0.667	0.0299
#Reg English Only Classes/Day	-0.001	0.9981	0.171	0.1248
#Eng Only Red/Modified Contnt	0.085	0.0083	0.375	0.0022
#Classes/Day W/ Native Lang	-0.014	0.8417	-0.589	0.0522
%Time Nat Lang in Class	0.035	0.4360	-0.123	0.4686
%Time Teacher Nat Lang Beg86	-0.032	0.4318	0.209	0.1413
%Time Teacher Nat Lang End87	-0.026	0.7463	-0.454	0.0733
Size Special Lang Classroom	0.036	0.5573	-0.633	0.0012
Size of Regular Classroom	-0.049	0.3517	-0.143	0.4241

Significance of Models

Of the six models computed, only three were statistically significant: (1) subjective success for bilingual students in grades 1 - 6; (2) objective success for bilingual students in grades 1 - 6; and (3) objective success for ESL students at grades 7 - 12. For the remaining models, high variability in program characteristics, along small numbers of students, may preclude statistically significant predictions. Nonsignificant models will not be considered further.

Dual Service

In each of the three regression models to be discussed, there was a significant relationship between dual service and success. In each case, fewer students receiving dual service were rated successful, as compared to students not receiving dual service.

TABLE 42
PERCENT OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS RATED SUCCESSFUL
BY DUAL SERVICE

	GRADES 1-6 DUAL SERVICE	
	Yes	No
Subjective	46	63
Objective	40	57

In an attempt to determine if these students "needed" more service and thus, could not be expected to perform as well, distributions on the 1985-86 English achievement test were examined for the bilingual group. The results of this analysis indicate that students receiving dual service tend to achieve lower percentiles on this test. There were enough students in the very lowest performance category to select only those students who were below the 20th percentile and re-examine the issue.

TABLE 43
PERCENT OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS IN GRADES 1-6
RATED SUCCESSFUL BY DUAL SERVICE SELECTED FOR STUDENTS
SCORING BELOW THE 20TH PERCENTILE IN ACHIEVEMENT

The tabled variable is the percentage of students rated successful within the categories of receiving more than one type of compensatory service (dual service).

SUCCESS RATING	DUAL SERVICE Yes	No
Subjective	39	52
Objective	39	46

As can be seen in Table 43, after controlling for the achievement level by selecting only the lowest performing students, there is still a greater likelihood that a larger percentage of successful students will not be receiving dual service. Furthermore, this is true for either measure of success. Dual service could easily be detrimental if the student is subject to conflicting instructional methods or if pace levels are different enough to cause interference in the learning situation.

Number of Regular and Reduced Content English-Only Classes Per Day

A significant relationship was found between the numbers of English-only classes and subjective success for bilingual students in grades 1 - 6. In general, higher numbers of English-only academic classes were positively related to subjective success. Although the same general pattern of results was evident for the objective measure, the

relationship was not statistically significant. There was a nonlinear relationship between both objective and subjective success and the number of English-only reduced or modified content classes. As shown in Table 44, the percentage of successful students is highest for one class, lowest for two through four classes, and rises for five or more classes. A somewhat similar pattern was found for students in the ESL program in grades 7 - 12. Although the numbers in this latter group were small, there were students in each category of classes.

TABLE 44
PERCENT OF STUDENTS RATED SUCCESSFUL
BY NUMBER OF REDUCED/MODIFIED CONTENT CLASSES PER DAY

	NUMBER OF REDUCED/MODIFIED CLASSES PER DAY				
SUCCESS RATING	1	2	3	4	5 OR MORE
Bilingual (Grades 1-6):					
Subjective	35	16	12	13	24
Objective	41	14	6	13	26
ESL (Grades 7-12):					
Subjective	51	23	7	3	15
Objective	62	23	0	0	15

Another analysis attempted to establish the relationship between the number of reduced/modified content classes per day and need for service. To do this, the number of special classes per day was examined by the number of objectives passed on the 1987 TEAMS test for bilingual students. It was expected that students passing higher percentages of objectives would be enrolled in fewer reduced/modified content classes, while those passing fewer objectives would be enrolled in a number of reduced/modified courses. However, the analysis indicated little difference in the numbers of reduced/modified classes per day across student performance categories. This finding would tend to indicate that decisions to enroll special language students in reduced/modified courses are based on factors other than student performance. However, since the data for this analysis contained a number of missing values, the results may not accurately reflect the entire special language population. As a result, no conclusions may be made from this finding. Although additional analyses were attempted to further examine the relationship between the number of reduced/modified classes per day and the need for service, the results were generally inconclusive or unstable.

Percent of Time in Native Language Instruction

For bilingual students in grades 1 - 6, the percentage of time the teacher used the student's native language at the beginning of the year was predictive of objective success. In addition, the percentage used at the end of the year was predictive of both measures of success for

this group. In general, the relationship suggests that the less native language used, the more likely the student was to be rated successful, although the pattern is not linear.

TABLE 45
PERCENT OF TIME IN NATIVE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION FOR
BILINGUAL STUDENTS BY SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

Tabled variable is the percentage of students rated successful

	PERCENT OF TIME IN NATIVE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION				
TIME OF YEAR	>80%	60-79%	40-59%	20-39%	<20%
Beginning-Objective	30	57	44	48	56
End -Objective	50	30	35	49	54
-Subjective	44	39	46	55	63

Size of Classroom

The size of the classroom was expected to be significantly related to success since smaller student to instructor ratios increase the opportunity for individualized attention, meaning the student's particular instructional needs are more likely to be met. In this study, however, the size of the regular classroom was not related to success. There was, however, a significant relationship between the size of the student's classes for special language instruction and objective success for bilingual students in grades 1 - 6 and for ESL students in grades 7 - 12. Table 46 contains the percentage of students rated successful by various sizes of special language classrooms. For bilingual programs in the lower grades, a classroom of between 11 and 18 students appears to be an optimal size. The results for older ESL students present a slightly different picture in that, larger class size was associated with success. However, the percentages for this latter group are based on very small numbers and are likely to be unstable.

TABLE 46
PERCENT OF STUDENTS RATED SUCCESSFUL BY SIZE OF
SPECIAL LANGUAGE CLASSROOM

The tabled value is the percentage of students in the various sizes of classrooms who were objectively successful.

	SIZE OF SPECIAL LANGUAGE CLASSROOM				
	<10	11-18	19-22	23-30	>30
Grades 1-6 Bilingual	41	58	44	45	-
Grades 7-12 ESL	30	31	50	67	-

BLOCK 5: Instructional Strategies

This block examines the relationship of specific instructional strategies to success. These strategies are more specific to the individual student than those examined in the campus section.

For these analyses, the questions regarding instructional strategies were asked in terms of location but were coded in terms of presence or absence (yes or no). For example, question 56 asked whether the instructional program for a particular student included "all essential elements covered at the same depth as for regular students." The response choices were: A. special language only class; B. English-only class; C. Both A and B; and D. Neither A nor B. For purposes of the regression analyses, responses A through C were coded as a "yes" and D as a "no". Variables found to be predictive of success were examined across the full range of responses to determine whether the location of a particular instructional strategy was important to success.

TABLE 47
BILINGUAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	10	2.536	0.0055		
ERROR	637			R-SQUARE	0.0381

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	10	2.438	0.0082		
ERROR	321			R-SQUARE	0.0706

VARIABLE	SUBJECTIVE PARAMETER	SUBJECTIVE PROB >|T|	OBJECTIVE PARAMETER	OBJECTIVE PROB >|T|
Intercept	1.672	0.0001	9.128	0.0001
All EE* At Same Depth As Reg	0.180	0.0083	0.404	0.1585
All EE At Less Depth	0.051	0.3275	0.142	0.5206
Fewer EE Than Reg Students	-0.064	0.2365	0.168	0.4695
Mastery Learning	0.100	0.1903	0.024	0.9474
Test Taking Skills	-0.079	0.3828	-0.560	0.1530
Additional Time on Task	-0.022	0.6937	0.362	0.1371
Computerized Instruction	-0.030	0.4604	0.108	0.5390
Tutoring Within School Day	-0.095	0.0267	-0.614	0.0020
Tutoring Before/After Day	-0.098	0.0183	-0.537	0.0043
Grouping By Ability	-0.048	0.4666	0.006	0.9811

* EE denotes Essential Elements

TABLE 48
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL
STRATEGIES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	10	5.237	0.0001		
ERROR	468			R-SQUARE	0.1006

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	10	3.306	0.0006		
ERROR	170			R-SQUARE	0.1628

VARIABLE	SUBJECTIVE PARAMETER	SUBJECTIVE PROB >|T|	OBJECTIVE PARAMETER	OBJECTIVE PROB >|T|
Intercept	1.428	0.0001	8.566	0.0001
All EE* At Same Depth As Reg	0.223	0.0010	0.958	0.0115
All EE At Less Depth	0.025	0.6470	0.164	0.5704
Fewer EE Than Reg Students	-0.155	0.0066	-0.312	0.3115
Mastery Learning	0.069	0.2815	0.169	0.6483
Test Taking Skills	0.134	0.1136	0.779	0.1701
Additional Time on Task	-0.030	0.6270	-0.348	0.2671
Computerized Instruction	-0.023	0.6147	-0.134	0.5461
Tutoring Within School Day	-0.076	0.1049	-0.670	0.0061
Tutoring Before/After Day	-0.094	0.0401	-0.203	0.3909
Grouping By Ability	0.029	0.6770	0.298	0.4193

* EE denotes Essential Elements

TABLE 49
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL
STRATEGIES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 7-12

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	10	1.308	0.2274		
ERROR	215			R-SQUARE	0.0574

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	10	1.806	0.0682		
ERROR	106			R-SQUARE	0.1455

	SUBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE	
VARIABLE	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|
Intercept	1.393	0.0001	9.256	0.0001
All EE* At Same Depth As Reg	0.203	0.0154	0.643	0.0941
All EE At Less Depth	-0.063	0.3847	-0.399	0.1484
Fewer EE Than Reg Students	-0.044	0.5542	-0.264	0.3593
Mastery Learning	-0.093	0.2740	-0.143	0.6625
Test Taking Skills	-0.059	0.6403	0.699	0.2036
Additional Time on Task	-0.011	0.9076	-0.268	0.4713
Computerized Instruction	-0.039	0.5849	0.216	0.4561
Tutoring Within School Day	-0.008	0.9027	-0.396	0.1431
Tutoring Before/After Day	0.065	0.3423	0.102	0.7283
Grouping By Ability	0.044	0.5673	-0.085	0.7832

Of the six models computed, all models for students in the lower grades, regardless of program or measure of success, were statistically significant.

Essential Elements

Questions 56 on the data collection instrument asked whether the instructional program for a particular student included all essential elements covered at the same depth as for regular students. This variable was predictive of subjective success for bilingual students in grades 1 - 6 and of both measures of success for ESL students in the lower grades. As described previously, the pattern of the relationship was examined across all possible responses (special class only, regular class only, and both). However, some cells in these tables are so small as to be of questionable stability and are not presented.

TABLE 50
PERCENT OF STUDENTS RATED SUCCESSFUL GIVEN INSTRUCTION USING ALL OF THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS AT SAME DEPTH AS REGULAR STUDENTS
GRADES 1-6

PROGRAM	SUCCESS	SPECIAL CLASS ONLY	ENGLISH CLASS ONLY	BOTH CLASSES	NEITHER CLASS
Bilingual	Subjective	55.6	60.0	57.1	37.5
	Objective	51.1	57.9	47.7	44.2
ESL	Subjective	61.5	58.7	67.1	31.1
	Objective	-	50.7	49.6	-

Table 50 indicates that the location of the instruction using all of the essential elements is not nearly as critical as the usage. The patterns do not seem to differ markedly between the bilingual and ESL programs.

Covering all essential elements in less depth as for regular students (question 57) was not predictive of either measure of success for either special language program. However, there was a significant relationship between fewer essential elements covered than for regular students and a subjective success for ESL students. The distribution of this variable indicates that the use of this strategy is associated with nonsuccess. In general, these patterns are similar to those found in a study on compensatory education recently conducted by this office. As discussed in that study, these patterns may be related to expectations for success.

Tutoring

The instructional strategies of tutoring within the school day and tutoring before or after the school day were significantly related to both measures of success for bilingual students in grades 1 - 6. However, these relationships were of the nature that tutoring, regardless of when it occurred, was associated with nonsuccess. These results are somewhat parallel to those found in the companion compensatory study. It may be that the general form of tutoring received by special language students is not appropriate for their needs.

Neither mastery learning, test taking skills, additional time on task, nor computerized instruction were found to be predictive of success, regardless of the type of measure used or the type of program. In general, very few significant relationships were found between success and the instructional strategies assessed in this study. It appears that almost all of the predictive power in the significant models were carried by one or two variables. Although these variables were predictive in several cases in the compensatory study, it seems that similar efforts to capture specific instructional strategies in special language programs were not very productive.

BLOCK 6: Teacher Variables

In this block an examination of the relationship between selected teacher variables and student performance is presented.

TABLE 51
BILINGUAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR
TEACHER VARIABLES PREDICTING SUCCESS

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	7	1.045	0.3991		
ERROR	356			R-SQUARE	0.0201

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	7	.458	0.8645		
ERROR	193			R-SQUARE	0.0163

	SUBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE	
VARIABLE	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|
Intercept	1.248	0.0001	8.832	0.0001
Aide in Spec Lang Classroom	-0.008	0.7819	-0.021	0.8690
Aide in Regular Classroom	-0.026	0.4301	-0.111	0.4113
Coordination Regular/Spec Lang	0.025	0.2630	0.016	0.8638
Overall Experience Teaching	0.054	0.0859	0.040	0.7650
Bil/ESL Experience Teacher	-0.051	0.1051	-0.135	0.2859
Credentials	0.023	0.4930	-0.002	0.9891
#College Hrs Span Lang Course	0.030	0.1193	0.106	0.1964

TABLE 52
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR TEACHER VARIABLES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	7	.779	0.6070		
ERROR	374			R-SQUARE	0.0144

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	7	1.516	0.1656		
ERROR	142			R-SQUARE	0.0695

	SUBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE	
VARIABLE	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|	PARAMETER	PROB >|T|
Intercept	1.569	0.0001	9.482	0.0001
Aide in Spec Lang Classroom	-0.006	0.8445	-0.194	0.2454
Aide in Regular Classroom	-0.044	0.2603	-0.035	0.8504
Coordination Regular/Spec Lang	0.014	0.5922	-0.036	0.7719
Overall Experience Teaching	0.014	0.5756	0.173	0.1565
Bil/ESL Experience Teacher	-0.011	0.6256	0.060	0.5959
Credentials	-0.054	0.0997	-0.319	0.0374
#College Hrs Span Lang Course	0.006	0.6981	-0.050	0.4925

TABLE 53
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR TEACHER VARIABLES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 7-12

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	7	.403	0.8999		
ERROR	201			R-SQUARE	0.0138

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	7	1.086	0.3777		
ERROR	104			R-SQUARE	0.0681

	SUBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE	
VARIABLE	PARAMETER	PROB >[T]	PARAMETER	PROB >[T]
Intercept	1.525	0.0001	10.088	0.0001
Aide in Spec Lang Classroom	-0.037	0.3895	-0.111	0.5067
Aide in Regular Classroom	-0.049	0.3802	-0.256	0.2633
Coordination Regular/Spec Lang	0.016	0.6625	0.085	0.5296
Overall Experience Teaching	-0.007	0.8328	0.171	0.2208
Bil/ESL Experience Teacher	-0.007	0.8396	-0.343	0.0160
Credentials	0.033	0.4387	-0.080	0.6021
#College Hrs Span Lang Course	0.004	0.8508	0.092	0.2873

Significance of Models

None of the six models were significant in predicting either subjective or objective success regardless of type or level of special language program. Although none of the models were significant, there were some relationships with individual predictors that will be mentioned. Much as in the campus section, years of general teaching experience for bilingual teachers was associated with subjective success in that the more experience of the teacher, the less the students were rated successful. However, for ESL students in grades 7 - 12, increased teacher experience specific to special language programs was associated with higher percentages of subjective success. Although nonsignificant, the direction of this relationship for bilingual students also suggests that specific experience with the program yields better student performance.

BLOCK 7: Parental Involvement

The next presentation block examines the relationship of various parental variables to student success. Tables 54, 55, and 56 contain the results of the regression analyses for these variables.

TABLE 54
BILINGUAL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR PARENT
VARIABLES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	3.727	0.0052		
ERROR	774			R-SQUARE	0.0189

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	2.910	0.0215		
ERROR	393			R-SQUARE	0.0288

	SUBJECTIVE		OBJECTIVE	
VARIABLE	PARAMETER	PROB >[T]	PARAMETER	PROB >[T]
Intercept	1.144	0.0001	7.324	0.0001
Parent In PTA/PTO	0.076	0.0100	0.331	0.0145
Parent In Classroom	0.024	0.5549	0.065	0.7162
Number Of Conferences	0.041	0.0098	0.187	0.0103
Parent In Adult Ed Classwork	0.008	0.7895	0.023	0.8700

TABLE 55
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR PARENT VARIABLES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 1-6

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	1.671	0.1554		
ERROR	479			R-SQUARE	0.0138

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	1.300	0.2717		
ERROR	181			R-SQUARE	0.0279

VARIABLE	SUBJECTIVE PARAMETER	SUBJECTIVE PROB >[T]	OBJECTIVE PARAMETER	OBJECTIVE PROB >[T]
Intercept	1.207	0.0001	8.771	0.0001
Parent In PTA/PTO	0.044	0.2935	0.228	0.2482
Parent In Classroom	0.060	0.2849	-0.007	0.9806
Number Of Conferences	0.049	0.0590	-0.192	0.1460
Parent In Adult Ed Classwork	-0.043	0.2913	-0.001	0.9957

TABLE 56
ESL REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR PARENT VARIABLES PREDICTING SUCCESS
GRADES 7-12

A: SUBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	1.281	0.2780		
ERROR	235			R-SQUARE	0.0213

B: OBJECTIVE

SOURCE	DF	F VALUE	PROB>F		
MODEL	4	1.930	0.1095		
ERROR	125			R-SQUARE	0.0582

VARIABLE	SUBJECTIVE PARAMETER	SUBJECTIVE PROB >[T]	OBJECTIVE PARAMETER	OBJECTIVE PROB >[T]
Intercept	1.629	0.0001	8.007	0.0001
Parent In PTA/PTO	0.012	0.8565	0.050	0.8668
Parent In Classroom	0.009	0.9429	1.032	0.0362
Number Of Conferences	-0.056	0.0937	0.036	0.7911
Parent In Adult Ed Classwork	-0.096	0.0890	-0.561	0.0235

Parental Involvement

Two parental variables were found to be predictive of both objective and subjective success for bilingual students in grades 1 - 6. These were participation in PTA/PTO organizations and the number of parent/teacher conferences. These variables were found to be predictive of success for compensatory education students as well. Students whose parents participate in PTA/PTO organizations are more likely to be successful, while students whose parents have higher numbers of teacher conferences are more likely to be unsuccessful. As shown in Table 58, the percentages of students in the success group are fairly stable until the number of conferences exceeds five after which the percentages drop sharply. It is possible that a small number of conferences are helpful in setting common goals and sharing understanding of classroom activities, while a larger number are indicative of discipline or learning problems. If such problems are severe, it is unlikely that additional conferences will contribute to successful outcomes.

TABLE 57
NUMBER OF PARENT/TEACHER CONFERENCES DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR
GRADES 1-6

	NUMBER OF CONFERENCES				
SUCCESS	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8 OR MORE
Subjective	58%	56%	58%	40%	46%
Objective	51%	53%	50%	41%	32%

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, summary discussions of four issues will integrate the findings from the various data sources. These data were collected for various purposes and are typically general in nature. However, examination of specific variables associated with these issues was not the intent of this overview study, although it was possible to identify some aspects of instruction, teacher capabilities, and parental involvement associated with student success. These relationships are evident on a statewide basis, acknowledging that educational environments are unique to each district and campus.

Any recommendations included in this report are derived from an evaluation perspective. Final recommendations to districts are expected to be presented within the format of the REACH documents produced by the Agency. Any specific recommendations contained in the document will be developed by Agency program staff on the basis of this report as well as program descriptions derived from on-site visits to campuses identified as exhibiting superior performance on the measures included in this study.

For this concluding discussion, the issues considered focus on:

- Students
- Programs
- Teachers
- Parents

Although it is impossible to consider each of these issues in isolation, the central findings regarding each will be reviewed. Before discussing the specific issues, a review of the definitions of success as used in this study, is presented.

Definition of Success

The criteria used to judge the impact of instruction are central to the discussion of the impact of bilingual programs. Success may be based on objective or subjective measures, and as was seen in the Findings section, these perspectives do not always coincide. Obtaining several different measures of objective success was integral to this study. The measures obtained included test scores, promotion and retention rates, exit rates, and measures of essential element mastery and grade-level performance. A composite measure of selected outcomes was constructed for use in evaluating the student specific data. In addition, a subjective measure of success was also obtained for each student. As a result, the findings of this study are not predicated upon one specific outcome measure but rather upon a broad-based perspective of performance.

STUDENT ISSUES

Clearly, the type of students in special language programs is an issue of interest. However, this discussion is limited to the state in

general; that is, types of students vary considerably from region to region and from district to district. Campus data indicated that 86 percent of the bilingual and 74 percent of the ESL students were eligible for free/reduced price lunch. Quite similarly, student data indicated that 73 percent of the ESL and 91 percent of the bilingual students were eligible for free/reduced price lunch. It should be quite obvious that these students not only have a language deficit but are also from low income families and presumably lack experience with enrichment activities, a deficiency generally associated with lack of resources.

On the basis of student data, approximately 16 percent of the ESL students and 12 percent of the bilingual students were found to have been classified as migrant within the last five years. Student data clearly indicated a difference between programs in the likelihood that a student had been educated in the native country. Forty-two percent of ESL students had received some formal instruction in their native country, while only 23 percent of bilingual students had received formal instruction outside the United States. For approximately 23 percent of the students in either program, response to the item regarding education in the native country was "unknown."

Because of apparent background differences between students in the two programs, as well as other differences such as ESL programs being more likely in smaller districts or for students who are not primarily Spanish-speaking, direct comparisons between the two programs should be approached with caution. These differences also hinder broad interpretation of studies designed to carefully select comparable teachers, schools, and students for the purposes of contrasting student performance between ESL and bilingual approaches. Even if one method is found to be superior to another on a statewide basis, this information may have limited utility due to diverse student populations, the availability of qualified teachers, and variations in district resources. To exemplify the differences in studies, a comparison between the "Longitudinal Study of Immersion, Early-Exit, and Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education Programs for Language-Minority Children" and this study is included as Appendix D to this report.

As reported by the Division of Student Assessment, the percentage of both bilingual and ESL students passing the reading and mathematics portions of the 1987 Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) test was lower than the percentage of successful students who were not in special language programs. However, the results for students in the two programs were quite similar. Since students are in special language programs because of English language deficits, it is hardly surprising that their scores are somewhat lower than other students. When the TEAMS is administered in Spanish, bilingual students score roughly the same as other students score on the English version. The English and Spanish TEAMS are, however, not necessarily equivalent instruments. As a result, statements regarding the equivalency of performance must be carefully considered. Student data indicated results similar to those found in the TEAMS report, since students in the two programs perform equally. This is not, however, an exact equivalence. In general, the percentage of students scoring below 60

percent of the objectives mastered was the same for both groups but a higher percentage of bilingual students scored in the very top group with Texas Assessment of Basic Skills data exhibiting the same pattern.

Student data from 1986 and 1987 achievement testing also indicated that the performance of bilingual and ESL students was similar. Moreover, students in both programs significantly increased in percentile standing. Campus data was obtained indicating the percentage of students exiting and remaining in the program for different achievement levels. Again, results indicated little difference between bilingual and ESL programs.

Student data showed no increase in oral language proficiency for only 5 percent of students in both programs. In most cases, oral language proficiency assessments were made using formal testing procedures, and both groups were using the native language less at the end of the school year in classroom and nonclassroom settings.

Exit from special language programs is related to the issues of achievement testing and use of the native language. Campus data indicated that ESL programs had a significantly higher exit rate across grade levels PK - 6. Since there were very few students in bilingual programs at higher grade levels, data regarding the exit rates of these students was inadequate for the purpose of comparison. Exit rates were generally higher for campuses within smaller districts, but this trend was far from stable. In fact, some analyses indicated that the differences between ESL and bilingual exit rates were quite small for these districts. However, for campuses with a small percentage of minority students, the difference in exit rates between the programs was quite large with the ESL exit rate exceeding the bilingual rate by 27 percent.

In addition to exit rates, promotion to the next grade level was also investigated. As opposed to findings based on exit rate data, bilingual programs exhibited a higher promotion rate than ESL programs. This difference, in the range of 4 to 8 percentage points, was much smaller than that found between prekindergarten through sixth grade exit rates. However, there were no large differences between promotion rates for various demographic categories. Student data also revealed similar promotion rates but in this case, ESL students were promoted at a slightly higher rate.

The number of students scheduled for additional remediation (e.g. Chapter 1 compensatory services) after exiting the special language program provides an additional view of performance. There was a significant difference between the two programs on this measure. Students in ESL programs were reported as needing less compensatory service after exiting the program. To investigate this difference, the programs were further divided into "early" and "late" exit strategies. The early and late strategies were determined by the percentage of students exiting at particular achievement levels. Campuses with an early exit strategy exhibited a higher need for remediation with relatively greater need for remediation for students in bilingual programs. However, for campuses employing a late exit strategy, there

was generally less need for remediation and little difference was found between the programs.

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

Campus-level data revealed that 65 percent of the students in both ESL and bilingual programs received some form of dual service. That is, the students received some form of compensatory service in addition to the special language program. While the percentage of dual service indicated by student data was somewhat smaller at 50 percent, a significant portion of the students received more than one type of service. However, as described in the student section of this report, even controlling for student need (defined as scoring below the 20th percentile), students receiving dual service were not objectively or subjectively more successful than those only receiving special language instruction. In fact, dual service could be detrimental if the student is receiving conflicting learning strategies or if the pace levels are different enough to cause interference in learning situations.

The use of reduced/modified content classes was also associated with student success. Specifically, the more reduced content classes per day, the less likely the student would be successful. Similarly, instruction of the essential elements at grade level was positively associated with success, even for students most in need as determined by initial Texas Assessment of Basic Skills test scores. Again, the relationship between high expectations and success deserves further investigation.

TEACHERS AND AIDES

There were clear differences between the programs in the years of teachers' special language experience. Both campus and student data indicated that bilingual teachers had much more experience in the special language field. Furthermore, both types of data showed that approximately twice as many teachers were teaching on special permits or waivers in ESL programs. However, campus data indicated that twice as many ESL teachers had earned graduate degrees. In addition, bilingual programs were found to be more likely to use aides in special language classrooms and English only classrooms. Finally, ESL teachers were less likely to have coordination with regular teachers. Specifically, 50 percent of bilingual as opposed to 40 percent of ESL teachers had daily or weekly coordination with regular classroom teachers.

PARENTS

Parental involvement in the instructional program was positively related to both subjective and objective measures of success. On the other hand, the number of parent/teacher conferences was associated with nonsuccess.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

This study examined the current operation of special language programs in Texas including both bilingual and ESL approaches. Similar performance outcomes were found for both types of programs and there also were many instructional similarities. However, there are many differences between the teachers and students in the two programs. The differences in teacher experience, certification, and graduate training indicate that the instruction provided differs in more areas than the amount of native language used during the class period. Similarly, differences were found between the percentage of students eligible for the free/reduced price lunch program, the amount of schooling in the student's native country, and in the achievement status of students upon entry into the special language program.

It was discouraging to discover that few instructional strategies could be linked to success or lack of success. This may indicate that instructional variables and variations may be more subtle than those investigated in this study. Although performance levels have been identified to allow districts to make comparisons to their own outcomes, the factors leading to enhanced performance have not been objectively identified. Longitudinal studies and further investigation of successful programs will clarify this area.

Certainly, the programs are affecting students through enhanced achievement levels, increases in basic skills measures, and in attaining oral language proficiency. Perhaps the most supportable finding of this study is that similar outcomes can be expected from both types of special language programs. The outcomes, however, depend upon the student being matched to the program designed to interact successfully with various aspects of community, parent, teacher, and of course, individual student characteristics.

REFERENCES

Austin Independent School District. 1987. Retention or promotion -- Have policies passed or failed? Austin, Texas: Austin Independent School District, ORE Publication No. 86.31.

Baker, K. 1987. Comment of Willig's a meta-analysis of selected studies in the effectiveness of bilingual education. Review of Educational Research 57(3):351-362.

Baker, K.A. and A.A. deKanter. 1981. Effectiveness of bilingual education: A review of literature. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Burry, J. 1981. An introduction to assessment and design in bilingual program evaluation. Los Angeles, California: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University.

Castellanos, D. 1983. The best of two worlds: Bilingual-bicultural education in the U.S. Trenton, New Jersey: New Jersey State Department of Education.

Danoff, M.N. and G.J. Coles. 1979. AIR researchers respond to Nickel's criticism. Phi Delta Kappan 16(December).

Dulay, H. and M. Burt. 1979. The efficacy of bilingual education. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 1(5).

Gumperz, J.J. 1977. Verbal strategies in multilingual communication, in bilingualism and language contact. In Spanish-English bilingual education in the U.S.: Current issues, resources, and research priorities. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Holmes, C. Thomas. 1983. The fourth R: Retention. Journal of Research and Development in Education 17(1):1-6.

McConnell, B.B. 1983. Needed: A new technology for evaluating bilingual education programs. Los Angeles, California: Bilingual Education Paper Series - Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University.

National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education. 1987. Ongoing OBEMLA-sponsored research. Forum 10(3):3.

Nickel, K.N. 1979. Experimentation, extrapolation, exaggeration: Thy name is research. Phi Delta Kappan 16(December).

Ramirez, M. and others. 1977. Spanish-English bilingual education in the U.S.: Current issues, resources, and research priorities. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Rodriguez-Brown, F.V. 1980. Do's and don'ts of bilingual program evaluation. Los Angeles, California: Bilingual Education Paper Series - Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University.

Shepard, Lorrie A. and Mary L. Smith. 1986. Synthesis of Research on school readiness and kindergarten retention. Educational Leadership 44(3):78-86.

Swain, M. 1978. School reform through bilingual education: Problems and some solutions in evaluating programs. Comparative Education Review 22(3).

Texas Education Agency 1986. Guidelines for language usage in bilingual education and English as a second language programs. Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, Publication No. AD6-320-01.

Troike, R.C. 1983. ¡Bilingual sí! Principal 62(3).

Troike, R.C. 1981. Synthesis of research on bilingual education. Educational Leadership 38(March):498-504.

Tucker, G.R. 1979. Bilingual education: Some perplexing observations. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 1(5).

Willig, A.C. 1985. A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. Review of Educational Research 55(3):269-317.

Willig, A.C. 1987. Examining bilingual education research through meta-analysis and narrative review: A response to Baker. Review of Educational Research 57(3):363-376.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC CODING USED FOR STUDENT SURVEY

The demographic codes used for the individual student surveys were constructed in a manner which prevents district identification. In order to ensure district anonymity, it was necessary to use coding which was less specific than that normally used with the Agency's Analyze procedure. Although the use of these codes limits the clarity of the demographic data, the purpose of including the codes was not to focus on demographic factors but to ensure that all types of districts were represented in the sample. The four-digit codes were constructed as follows:

Super Region Groupings

1 - ESC regions 1-3, 20
2 - ESC regions 4-7
3 - ESC regions 8-11
4 - ESC regions 12-15
5 - ESC regions 16-19

ADA Groupings

1 - Over 25,000 ADA
2 - 10,000 - 24,999 ADA
3 - 5,000 - 9,000 ADA
4 - 3,000 - 4,999 ADA
5 - 1,000 - 2,999 ADA
6 - Less than 1,000 ADA

Percent Minority Groupings

1 - Less than 13.5 percent
2 - 13.5 - 37.4 percent
3 - Greater than 37.4 percent

Wealth Groupings

1 - Less than $135,042 per student
2 - $135,042 - $246,052 per student
3 - Greater than $246,052 per student

APPENDIX B

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Data Collection Instrument	Page
Campuses in Districts with more than 1,000 ADA	B-1
Campuses in Districts with less than 1,000 ADA	B-13
Individual Student Questionnaires	B-21
Definitions	B-33

BILINGUAL/ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
1986-87 EVALUATION

TO: District Contact Person

SUBJECT: Instructions for Completion of Bilingual Evaluation Questionnaires

DUE DATES: September 1, 1987 (Part I) and September 30, 1987 (Part II)

QUESTIONS: Division of Program Evaluation, TEA, (512)463-9524

You have been designated by your superintendent as the contact person for this evaluation required for bilingual/English as a second language (ESL) by Texas Administrative Code, Sections 61.2(c)(3), 77.366, 77.356, and Texas Education Code 21.258. The attached data collection instruments are to be filled out for each campus that has a special language program and returned to the Texas Education Agency, Division of Program Evaluation. If additional copies of the data collection instrument are needed, the district may either call the Agency or reproduce the questionnaire. There is one additional instrument only for the district in general. Your responsibilities include distributing and collecting the instruments, returning completed instruments to the Texas Education Agency, answering questions from the campus contact, and resolving issues with the Division of Program Evaluation. Additionally you will be selecting students to participate in a profile study of these programs.

Your Packet of Materials should include:

- District Contact Instructions (this document).
- Definitions to be used in this study.
- A computer printout listing the district's demographic code and students for Part II.
- A verification of completion postcard for Part II.
- A form to list campuses not participating in the evaluation.
- Copies of Part I data collection instruments for each campus.
- Copies of the Part II student case study questionnaires.
- A Part III questionnaire for general district information.

PART I INSTRUCTIONS

There are two sections (a - description and b - performance) to the Part I instrument. Each campus that has either a bilingual or an English as a second language program will receive a Part I instrument. Those campuses where both are offered must receive two copies - one for each program. Make sure that each instrument is coded correctly with a "1" or a "2" to designate a bilingual or ESL program, respectively. Also check to see that the appropriate grade level designation is entered. Please review the attached list of definitions to make sure the campus contact person understands the questions asked. If a campus does not have a special language program and will not be completing a questionnaire, please list the campuses by county-district-campus number on Part III. If you have any concerns about these instructions or data collection instruments, please contact the Division of Program Evaluation.

Part Ia is a descriptive section for the program, while Part Ib is directed towards performance. Some specific questions in this instrument are not mandatory for school year 1986-87, however each campus is expected to provide as much information as is available. Note that campuses with both a bilingual and an ESL program need only complete questions Part Ia. H through J once. This should be done on the bilingual instrument.

After the completed instruments have been collected from all campuses, forward the complete package so that it will arrive at the Division of Program Evaluation by September 1, 1987. Reports are to be directed to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701

PART II INSTRUCTIONS

The second section of the evaluation of Bilingual/ESL programs is termed the student profile approach. Since programs can differ not only between campuses, but also within campuses, it is somewhat difficult to determine what constitutes a successful program. An alternative approach is to select successful students and then determine what factors contribute to their success. This approach requires a more in-depth examination of the students and their educational environment. While each district is to fill out these student profiles, only a few students are being requested from each district to limit the data burden as much as possible. The attached computer printout lists the numbers, grade levels, and programs for students for which information is requested.

For this approach to yield useful information several conditions must be met. These are as follows:

- Confidentiality Of Response. Each scan sheet is to have a demographic code (found on the computer printout) entered. This code does not uniquely identify any one district. The information on the scan sheet cannot be tracked to any teacher, campus or district. The TEA respectfully requests that you do not modify any responses on the scan sheets in order to "hide" the districts identity.

- Honesty Of Response. By ensuring anonymity, it is hoped that respondents will answer in an as honest a manner as possible.

- Completeness Of Response. Each district is responsible for the selection of students. Please select students for which you have the most complete information.

- Representativeness Of Response. Please allow the most knowledgeable person (usually the teacher) to fill out the information requested. When it is directed to find a "successful" or "non-successful" student, please select a student who is either in the top 10 percent (or bottom 10 percent) of students in that category. It is not necessary to find the worst or the best student.

USE OF DATA

As noted, these data will not be used to evaluate any teacher, campus or district. Rather, with the information provided, factors which are associated with

successful and non-successful students can be determined using the data base created in this study. Given accurate initial information, computer analyses can determine which factors are critical to a student's success or failure. Technical assistance documents can then be created and disseminated to all districts. This in turn will lead to better service for LEP students.

STUDENT SELECTION

Critical to the success of this evaluation is the selection of "good" examples of successful and non-successful students. It is realized that just as there are many different instructional approaches, there are many outcomes that may be evidenced from these programs. For this study, three different definitions will be used. One (or more) students will be selected according to each definition who is successful and one (or more) who is not. The numbers, grade levels, and programs for students to be selected are listed on the attached computer printout. It is understood that not all districts will have a student in each of the requested categories. Please find a student in as many categories as possible. Remember no district will or can be identified. Your honest cooperation is essential. The attached computer printout also includes the district's 4 digit demographic code which will be entered for each student under "IDENTIFICATION NUMBER" on the scan sheets. Below you will find definitions for the students to be selected. The code numbers refer to the type of student to be selected and must be entered on the scan sheet under "SPECIAL CODES" on side two of the scan sheet. There should be a 3 digit code for each student under the heading "SPECIAL CODES". Do not use columns 4, 5, and 6. Even though one student could fit in more than one of the categories, do not fill out more than one sheet on the same student.

NOTE: There is a space on the instructions for the student questionnaire for a student's name. You may enter a name to aid in the information gathering process since the instructions will not be returned to the Texas Education Agency.

SUCCESS CODES 111 and 121

From the attached computer printout find the number of students to be selected who fit the descriptions under Success Codes 111 and 121. These students are selected as follows:

> CODE 111: This is a student in a special language program in 1986-87. This student is considered a success of the program by your own district standards. The student may or may not have been promoted, passed TEAMS, or exited the program. Simply select a successful example by your own district's standards.
>
> CODE 121: This is a student in a special language program in 1986-87. This student is not considered a success of the program by your own district standards. The student may or may not have been promoted, passed TEAMS, or exited the program. Simply select a non-successful example by your own district's standards.

SUCCESS CODES 112 and 122

From the attached computer printout find the number of students to be selected as success codes 112 and 122. These students are selected as follows:

> CODE 112: This is a student who was in a special language program in 1985-86, but was not in 1986-87. This student was exited from the

successful and non-successful students can be determined using the data base created in this study. Given accurate initial information, computer analyses can determine which factors are critical to a student's success or failure. Technical assistance documents can then be created and disseminated to all districts. This in turn will lead to better service for LEP students.

STUDENT SELECTION

Critical to the success of this evaluation is the selection of "good" examples of successful and non-successful students. It is realized that just as there are many different instructional approaches, there are many outcomes that may be evidenced from these programs. For this study, three different definitions will be used. One (or more) students will be selected according to each definition who is successful and one (or more) who is not. The numbers, grade levels, and programs for students to be selected are listed on the attached computer printout. It is understood that not all districts will have a student in each of the requested categories. Please find a student in as many categories as possible. Remember no district will or can be identified. Your honest cooperation is essential. The attached computer printout also includes the district's 4 digit demographic code which will be entered for each student under "IDENTIFICATION NUMBER" on the scan sheets. Below you will find definitions for the students to be selected. The code numbers refer to the type of student to be selected and must be entered on the scan sheet under "SPECIAL CODES" on side two of the scan sheet. There should be a 3 digit code for each student under the heading "SPECIAL CODES". Do not use columns 4, 5, and 6. Even though one student could fit in more than one of the categories, do not fill out more than one sheet on the same student.

NOTE: There is a space on the instructions for the student questionnaire for a student's name. You may enter a name to aid in the information gathering process since the instructions will not be returned to the Texas Education Agency.

SUCCESS CODES 111 and 121

From the attached computer printout find the number of students to be selected who fit the descriptions under Success Codes 111 and 121. These students are selected as follows:

> CODE 111: This is a student in a special language program in 1986-87. This student is considered a success of the program by your own district standards. The student may or may not have been promoted, passed TEAMS, or exited the program. Simply select a successful example by your own district's standards.
>
> CODE 121: This is a student in a special language program in 1986-87. This student is not considered a success of the program by your own district standards. The student may or may not have been promoted, passed TEAMS, or exited the program. Simply select a non-successful example by your own district's standards.

SUCCESS CODES 112 and 122

From the attached computer printout find the number of students to be selected as success codes 112 and 122. These students are selected as follows:

> CODE 112: This is a student who was in a special language program in 1985-86, but was not in 1986-87. This student was exited from the

BILINGUAL/ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
PART IIIa

District Name _____ County-District Number _____

PART III INSTRUCTIONS

This section is to be answered for the district as a whole. Although there may be individual variations between campuses, please report a general description for the district in questions A-D. After you have completed this section, place the list of campuses not included in the study on top of all instruments and return to the Division of Program Evaluation.

A. No Formal Program at a Grade Level: Briefly state what services, if any, are provided to a LEP student when there is no bilingually certified or ESL endorsed teacher at the student's grade level.

B. Reasons for Parental Denials: In your opinion, briefly state the main reasons at your campus for parental denial of the bilingual/ESL program.

C. Former LEP Students: Referring only to LEP students who started their academic career in your school district, at what grade level are the majority of these students placed in a non-bilingual/ESL classroom?

D. Program Overview: Please attach a brief description (two pages or less) on your school's special language program(s) offered to LEP students. Include any other instructional methodologies utilized to meet the needs of LEP students and how program trnasitioning is accomplished for students exiting the program (Bilingual/ESL) and entering the regular English classroom. (For example, do students receive compensatory instructional services and then are placed in a regular English classroom.) Include the most significant outcomes of the program and any storng or weak points of these programs.

BILINGUAL/ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
PART IIIb

District Name _____ County-District Number _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY DISTRICT CONTACT AND RETURNED TO THE DIVISION OF PROGRAM EVALUATION WITH ALL COMPLETED COPIES OF PART IA AND B.

The campuses listed below (by county-district-campus number) do not offer a special language program and did not participate in the 1986-87 Bilingual/English as a Second Language Evaluation.

County-District-Campus Number:

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

Bilingual/English as a Second Language
1986-87 Evaluation

TO:	Campus Contact Person
SUBJECT:	Instructions for Completion of Evaluation Questionnaire
DUE DATE:	As Instructed by District Contact
QUESTIONS:	District Contact Person or TEA, Division of Program Evaluation (512) 463-9524

As required by Texas Administrative Code, Sections 61.2(c)(3), 77.366, 77.356, and Texas Education Code 21.258, staff on each campus is to fill out the attached data collection instrument. You must fill out a set for your bilingual program and/or a set for your ESL program. For those campuses where both programs are offered, please complete two copies—one for each program. Make sure that each instrument is coded correctly with a "1" or a "2" to designate a bilingual or ESL program, respectively. Please complete the necessary copies of Part Ib to reflect the program(s) and grade levels offered at your campus. (Note: Some grade levels in tables overlap.) Although not all of the information may be readily available, you are requested to make the best possible effort to complete the instrument. After you have completed both Part Ia and Part Ib, return the instrument to your district contact person. Your campus may or may not be involved in Part II (student profiles) of the data collection. Note in the campus descriptor that the grade levels offered may not exactly correspond to those on your campus. Simply pick the closest approximation. For example, a K-8 campus would indicate K-6.

—REPORT ONLY FOR YOUR CAMPUS—

District and Campus Name _____

County-District-Campus Number ___ ___ ___ - ___ ___ ___ - ___ ___ ___

1986-87 Statewide Evaluation of Bilingual Education

Part Ia. Program Description

Please enter the two digit code number to the right that best represents the grade span offered at your school. _____

11 = PreK-6 12 = 7-8 13 = 9-12

ALL RESPONSES ON THIS FORM (A-G) ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING PROGRAM: PLEASE SPECIFY BY ENTERING THE CORRESPONDING NUMBER TO THE RIGHT. _____

BILINGUAL = 1 ESL = 2

A. **Years of Implementation:** Please indicate the NUMBER OF YEARS your school has implemented the program specified above for the following grade spans. Enter the number of years which corresponds to the largest amount of time for any grade level. _____

B. **Instructor Description:** Provide the number of CERTIFIED OR ENDORSED TEACHERS that are **currently** providing instruction for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students by the number of years of bilingual/ESL experience (include current school year). If this information is not available, enter the total number.

Number of Years Teaching Special Language Program	**Number of Certified/ Endorsed Teachers**
1 year	_____
2-3 years	_____
4-5 years	_____
6 or more years	_____
Total	_____

C. How many special language teachers are on special permits or waivers? _____

D. **Percentage of Special Language Teachers with Graduate Degrees:** What percentage of the total certified or endorsed teachers have graduate degrees? (Referring only to the teachers in Question B.) _____ %

E. **Approximately** what percent of the students in this program also receive some form of compensatory instruction (i.e., Chapter 1 regular, migrant, or state compensatory education). _____ %

F. **Approximately** what percent of the students in this program are eligible for free/reduced price lunch. _____ %

G. **Check** the instructional approaches and the instructional arrangements employed at your campus. Please do **not** include any that are utilized with less than 10 percent of your students. If your campus has a PreK-K program please indicate in the column "PreK-K," otherwise indicate in the column "Other Grade Levels."

Instructional Approaches and Arrangements
By Grade Span

Check as Many as Apply	Grade Span		Check as Many as Apply	Grade Span	
	PreK-K	Other Grade Levels		PreK-K	Other Grade Levels
Mastery Learning			Self-Contained		
Computerized Drill and Practice			Team-Teaching		
ESL for Language Arts Instruction			Departmentalized		
ESL for Content Instruction			Resource Arrangement (pull-out)		
Native Language for Content Instruction			Lab With Computer		
Native Language for Language Arts Instruction			Team-Teaching		
Native Language for Clarification			Summer School		
Self-Paced			Individual Progress		
Study Skills			Aide in Class		
Test Taking Skills			Bilingual All Day		
Peer Tutor			Grouping Heterogeneously		
Tutorial			Grouping Homogeneously		
Additional Time on Task					

ONLY RESPOND TO THE REMAINING QUESTIONS (H-J) IN PART I ONLY **ONCE** PER CAMPUS. **IF** YOU HAVE **BOTH** A BILINGUAL AND AN ESL PROGRAM, RESPOND **ONLY** ON THE FORM WHICH DESCRIBES THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM.

Code Numbers for Testing Instruments (To be utilized for Question H)

Oral Language Proficiency Tests

Code Number	
01	Primary Acquisition of Language (PAL): Oral Language Dominance
02	Primary Acquisition of Language (PAL): Oral Language Proficiency Measure (OLPM)
03	Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM)
04	Basic Inventory of Natural Language (BINL)
05	Language Assessment Scales (LAS)
06	Shutt Primary Language Indicator Test (SPLIT): Listening and Verbal Fluency
07	Language Assessment Battery (LAB)
08	IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test
09	Maculaitis Assessment Program (MAC)
10	Secondary Level English Proficiency Test (SLEP)
11	Pre-LAS

English Achievement Tests

12	California Achievement Test (CAT)
13	American Testronics' Comprehensive Assessment Program Achievement Series
14	Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS)
15	Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) and Test of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP)
16	Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Survey Battery (MAT)
17	The Metropolitan Instructional Series, reading tests
18	The Metropolitan Instructional Series, language tests
19	National Test of Basic Skills
20	Science Research Associates Achievement Series (SRA)
21	The Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) and Test of Academic Skills (TASK)
22	Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (SDRT)
23	Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP III, Circus)
24	The 3R's Test, Achievement Edition

Spanish Achievement Tests

25	La Prueba de Realizacion
26	CTBS Espanol
27	Inter-American Series (La Prueba de Lectura)
28	Some Other Test

H. Provide the 2 digit code numbers corresponding to the tests used at your campus: (Please use code numbers on facing page.)

1. OLPT _____
2. English Achievement _____
3. Spanish Achievement _____

I. **Number of Current or Former LEP Students In a Gifted/Talented Program:** How many current or former LEP students enrolled at your school are receiving gifted/talented services in 1986-87? _____

J. **Testing Instruments for Special Language Programs:** Please provide your opinion of the testing instruments used on your campus for LEP students. Circle the response that indicates to what extent you agree with the statement.

	Do Not Agree			Totally Agree
1. The Oral Language Proficiency Test (OLPT) administered by my school district accurately determines the English proficiency of LEP students.	1	2	3	4
2. The OLPT administered by my school district is useful in determining the instructional approach to utilize with LEP students.	1	2	3	4
3. The OLPT administered by my school district is difficult to administer.	1	2	3	4
4. The Spanish achievement tests on the state approved test list accurately measure the Spanish achievement of LEP students.	1	2	3	4
5. The English achievement test administered by my school district accurately measures the English achievement of LEP students.	1	2	3	4
6. The Spanish TEAMS should be used to measure Spanish achievement at grades 1 and 3 in lieu of other tests.	1	2	3	4

Ib. Program Specific

Performance Information on the Instructional Program for LEP Students in Grade Levels PreK-6 and 7-12

A. **LEP Students Exiting the Instructional Program:** Complete the table below by grade level, indicate the number of LEP students exiting the instructional program in the spring of 1987 and who are **not** scheduled to be enrolled in the program in the fall of 1987. Although exact counts may not be available, please carefully estimate the requested information.

Categories	GRADE LEVELS							
	PreK or 7	K or 8	1 or 9	2 or 10	3 or 11	4 or 12	5	6
1. Scheduled to be promoted to next grade level								
2. Retained in present grade level								
3. Placed in next grade level								
4. Scheduled to receive some other form of instructional services (compensatory)								
*5. Scoring between 23rd and 40th percentile on both reading and language arts subtests of a standardized English achievement test								
*6. Scoring at or above 40th percentile on both reading and language arts subtests of a standardized English achievement test.								

B. **LEP Students Remaining in the Instructional Program:** Complete the table below by indicating the number of LEP students per grade level that will continue in the program in 1987-88. Although exact counts may not be available, please carefully estimate the requested information.

Categories	GRADE LEVELS							
	PreK or 7	K or 8	1 or 9	2 or 10	3 or 11	4 or 12	5	6
1. Promoted to next grade level								
2. Retained in present grade level								
3. Placed in next grade level								
4. Scheduled to receive other compensatory services								
*5. Scoring below the 23rd percentile on both reading and language arts subtests of a standardized English achievement test								
*6. Scoring between the 23rd and 40th percentile on both reading and language arts subtests of a standardized English achievement test.								

*These sections are not mandatory for 1986-87. If available, please provide.

BILINGUAL/ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
1986-87 EVALUATION

TO: District Contact Person

SUBJECT: Instructions for Completion of Bilingual Evaluation Questionnaires

DUE DATES: September 1, 1987 (Part I) and September 30, 1987 (Part II)

QUESTIONS: Division of Program Evaluation, TEA, (512)463-9524

You have been designated by your superintendent as the contact person for this evaluation required for bilingual/English as a second language (ESL) by Texas Administrative Code, Sections 61.2(c)(3), 77.366, 77.356, and Texas Education Code 21.258. The attached data collection instruments are to be filled out for each campus that has a special language program and returned to the Texas Education Agency, Division of Program Evaluation. If additional copies of the data collection instrument are needed, the district may either call the Agency or reproduce the questionnaire. Your responsibilities include distributing and collecting the instruments, returning completed instruments to the Texas Education Agency, answering questions from the campus contact, and resolving issues with the Division of Program Evaluation. Additionally you will be selecting students to participate in a profile study of these programs.

Your Packet of Materials should include:

- District Contact Instructions (this document).
- Definitions to be used in this study.
- A computer printout detailing students to be selected for Part II.
- A verification of completion postcard for Part II.
- A form to list campuses not participating in the evaluation.
- Copies of Part I data collection instruments for each campus.
- Copies of the Part II student case study questionnaires.

PART I INSTRUCTIONS

Each campus that has either a bilingual or an English as a second language program will receive Part I of the instrument. Those campuses where both are offered must receive two copies - one for each program. Make sure that each instrument is coded correctly with a "1" or a "2" to designate a bilingual or ESL program, respectively. Also check to see that the appropriate grade level designation is entered. Please review the attached list of definitions to make sure the campus contact person understands the questions asked. If a campus does not have a special language program and will not be completing a questionnaire, please list the campuses by county-district-campus number on the form included in this packet. If you have any concerns about these instructions or data collection instruments, please contact the Division of Program Evaluation.

Some specific questions in this instrument are not mandatory for school year 1986-87, however each campus is expected to provide as much information as is available. Note that campuses with both a bilingual and an ESL program need only complete questions Part I, D through E once. This should be done on the bilingual instrument.

After the completed instruments have been collected from all campuses, forward the complete package so that it will arrive at the Division of Program Evaluation by September 1, 1987. Reports are to be directed to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701

PART II INSTRUCTIONS

The second section of the evaluation of Bilingual/ESL programs is the collection of student profiles. Since programs can differ not only between campuses, but also within campuses, it is somewhat difficult to determine what constitutes a successful program. An alternative approach is to select successful students and then determine what factors contribute to their success. This approach requires a more in-depth examination of the students and their educational environment. While each district is to fill out these student profiles, only a few students are being requested from each district to limit the data burden. The attached computer printout lists the numbers, grade levels, and programs for students for which information is requested.

For this approach to yield useful information several conditions must be met. These are as follows:

- Confidentiality Of Response. Each scan sheet is to have a demographic code (found on the computer printout) entered. This code does not uniquely identify any one district. The information on the scan sheet cannot be tracked to any teacher, campus or district. The TEA respectfully requests that you do not modify any responses on the scan sheets in order to "hide" the districts identity.

- Honesty Of Response. By ensuring anonymity, it is hoped that respondents will answer in an as honest a manner as possible.

- Completeness Of Response. Each district is responsible for the selection of students. Please select students for which you have the most complete information.

- Representativeness Of Response. Please allow the most knowledgeable person (usually the teacher) to fill out the information requested. When it is directed to find a "successful" or "non-successful" student, please select a student who is either in the top 10 percent (or bottom 10 percent) of students in that category. It is not necessary to find the worst or the best student.

USE OF DATA

As noted, these data will not be used to evaluate any teacher, campus or district. Rather, with the information provided, factors which are associated with successful and non-successful students can be determined using the data base created in this study. Given accurate initial information, computer analyses can determine which factors are critical to a student's success or failure. Technical assistance documents can then be created and disseminated to all districts. This in turn will lead to better service for LEP students.

STUDENT SELECTION

Critical to the success of this evaluation is the selection of "good" examples of successful and non-successful students. It is realized that just as there are many different instructional approaches, there are many outcomes that may be evidenced from these programs. For this study, three different definitions will be used. One (or more) students will be selected according to each definition who is successful and one (or more) who is not. The numbers, grade levels, and programs for students to be selected are listed on the attached computer printout. It is understood that not all districts will have a student in each of the requested categories. Please find a student in as many categories as possible. Remember no district will or can be identified. Your honest cooperation is essential. The attached computer printout also includes the district's 4 digit demographic code which will be entered for each student under "IDENTIFICATION NUMBER" on the scan sheets. Below you will find definitions for the students to be selected. The code numbers refer to the type of student to be selected and must be entered on the scan sheet under "SPECIAL CODES" on side two of the scan sheet. There should be a 3 digit code for each student under the heading "SPECIAL CODES". Do not use columns 4, 5, and 6. Even though one student could fit in more than one of the categories, do not fill out more than one sheet on the same student.

NOTE: There is a space on the instructions for the student questionnaire for a student's name. You may enter a name to aid in the information gathering process since the instructions will not be returned to the Texas Education Agency.

SUCCESS CODES 111 and 121

From the attached computer printout find the number of students to be selected who fit the descriptions under Success Codes 111 and 121. These students are selected as follows:

> CODE 111: This is a student in a special language program in 1986-87. This student is considered a success of the program by your own district standards. The student may or may not have been promoted, passed TEAMS, or exited the program. Simply select a successful example by your own district's standards.
>
> CODE 121: This is a student in a special language program in 1986-87. This student is not considered a success of the program by your own district standards. The student may or may not have been promoted, passed TEAMS, or exited the program. Simply select a non-successful example by your own district's standards.

SUCCESS CODES 112 and 122

From the attached computer printout find the number of students to be selected as success codes 112 and 122. These students are selected as follows:

> CODE 112: This is a student who was in a special language program in 1985-86, but was not in 1986-87. This student was exited from the program by exceeding the required performance levels and not because of parental denial. This student may or may not have been in another compensatory program in 1986-87. This student did pass both reading and mathematics sections of the 1987 TEAMS. [SPECIAL NOTE: If your district is to select more than one student per category, please try to

select a student who has and one who has not received compensatory programs in 1986-87.]

CODE 122: This is a student who was in a special language program in 1985-86, but was not in 1986-87. This student was exited from the program by exceeding the required performance levels and not because of parental denial. This student may or may not have been in another compensatory program in 1986-87. This student did NOT pass both reading and mathematics sections of the 1987 TEAMS. [SPECIAL NOTE: If your district is to select more than one student per category, please try to select a student who has and one who has not received compensatory programs in 1986-87.]

SUCCESS CODES 113 AND 123

From the attached computer printout find the number of students to be selected as success codes 113 and 123. These students are selected as follows:

CODE 113: This is a student who was in a special language program in 1985-86 and continued in the program in 1986-87. This student may or may not be in compensatory education in 1986-87 and may or may not have passed TEAMS. This student, however, will be promoted (not placed) to the next grade level for 1987-88. [SPECIAL NOTE: If your district is to select more than one student per category, please try to select a student who has and one who has not received compensatory programs in 1986-87.]

CODE 123: This is a student who was in a special language program in 1985-86 and continued in the program in 1986-87. This student may or may not be in compensatory education in 1986-87 and may or may not have passed TEAMS. This student, however, will NOT be promoted (but may be placed) to the next grade level for 1987-88. [SPECIAL NOTE: If your district is to select more than one student per category, please try to select a student who has and one who has not received compensatory programs in 1986-87.]

SELECTION OF CAMPUSES

If you have more than one campus, you are encouraged to distribute these forms over several campuses in order to reduce the burden at any one campus. Remember, no campus or district can be identified.

The attached post card must be mailed when all student questionnaires of Part II are completed and mailed to the Division of Program Evaluation. Please do not mail the questionnaires and post card together (this is requested to ensure that student questionnaires are not identified to any school district).

QUESTIONS: Call the Division of Program Evaluation at (512)463-9524.

District Name

County-District Number

TO BE COMPLETED BY DISTRICT CONTACT AND RETURNED TO THE DIVISION OF PROGRAM EVALUATION WITH ALL COMPLETED COPIES OF PART I.

The campuses listed below (by county-district-campus number) do not offer a special language program and did not participate in the 1986-87 Bilingual/English as a Second Language Evaluation.

County-District-Campus Number:

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

__ __ __-__ __ __-__ __ __

Bilingual/English As A Second Language
1986-87 Evaluation

TO:	Campus Contact Person
SUBJECT:	Instructions for Completion of Evaluation Questionnaire
DUE DATE:	As Instructed by District Contact
QUESTIONS:	District Contact Person or TEA, Division of Program Evaluation (512)463-9524

As required by Texas Administrative Code, Sections 61.2(c)(3), 77.366, 77.356, and Texas Education Code 21.258, staff on each campus is to fill out the attached data collection instrument. You must fill out a set for your bilingual program and/or a set for your ESL program. For those campuses where both programs are offered, please complete two copies—one for each program. Make sure that each instrument is coded correctly with a "1" or a "2" to designate a bilingual or ESL program, respectively. Although not all of the information may be readily available, you are requested to make the best possible effort to complete the instrument. After you have completed Part I, return the instrument to your district contact person. Your campus may or may not be involved in Part II (student profiles) of the data collection. Note in the campus descriptor that the grade levels offered may not exactly correspond to those on your campus. Simply pick the closest approximation. For example, a K-8 campus would indicate K-6.

—REPORT ONLY FOR YOUR CAMPUS—

District and Camp is Name _____

County-District-Campus Number _____

1986-87 Statewide Evaluation of Bilingual Education

Part I. Program Description

Please enter the two digit code number to the right that best represents the grade span offered at your school. _____

11 = PreK-6 12 = 7-8 13 = 9-12

RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONS A-C ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING PROGRAM: PLEASE SPECIFY BY ENTERING THE CORRESPONDING NUMBER TO THE RIGHT.
REPORT ONLY FOR YOUR CAMPUS _____

BILINGUAL = 1 ESL = 2

A. **Instructor Description:** What is the total number of teachers **currently** providing instruction for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students that are: a) CERTIFIED OR ENDORSED or b) on SPECIAL PERMITS OR WAIVERS?

a) Number of CERTIFIED OR ENDORSED teachers _____

b) Number of teachers on SPECIAL PERMITS OR WAIVERS _____

B. **Approximately** what percent of the students in this program also receive some form of compensatory instruction (i.e., Chapter 1 regular, migrant, or state compensatory education). _____ %

C. **Approximately** what percent of the students in this program are eligible for free/reduced price lunch. _____ %

ONLY RESPOND TO THE REMAINING QUESTIONS (D-F) IN PART I ONLY **ONCE** PER CAMPUS. IF **YOU HAVE BOTH** A BILINGUAL AND AN ESL PROGRAM, RESPOND **ONLY** ON THE FORM WHICH DESCRIBES THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM.

*D. **Former LEP Students:** Referring only to LEP students who started their academic career in your school district, at what grade level are the majority of these students placed in a non-bilingual/ESL classroom? _____

*Question D is to be completed only at campuses that offer grade levels PreK-6

E. **Program Overview:** Please attach a brief description (one page or less) on your school's special language program(s) offered to LEP students. Include instructional methodologies utilized to meet the needs of LEP students, what services, if any, are provided to a LEP student when there is no bilingually certified or ESL endorsed teacher at the student's grade level, and how program transitioning is accomplished for students exiting the program (Bilingual/ESL) and entering the regular English classroom. (For example, do students receive compensatory instructional services and then are placed in a regular English classroom.) Include the most significant outcomes of the program and any strong or weak points of these programs.

T E X A S E D U C A T I O N A G E N C Y

STUDY OF BILINGUAL/ESL PROGRAMS 1984

SELECTION OF STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE "CASE STUDY" FOR PART II SHOULD INCLUDE STUDENTS FROM THE GROUPS BELOW. NAME SPACES ARE FOR DISTRICT USE ONLY. NO NAMES WILL BE USED IN THE STUDY.

-------- DISTRICT= ISD CD#= DEMOGRAPHIC CODE=1631 --------

	STUDENT NAMES (OPTIONAL)	CODE NUMBER	GRADE LEVEL	PROGRAM
1.	_____	121	3	ESL
2.	_____	121	3	ESL
3.	_____	112	3	ESL
4.	_____	120	3	ESL
5.	_____	123	3	ESL
6.	_____	111	5	BILINGUAL

—DO NOT RETURN THESE INSTRUCTIONS—

II. Bilingual/ESL Student Specific Information

The Texas Education Agency is conducting an evaluation of bilingual edu-cation programs and would like information on specific students for a general "student profile study". ALL RESPONSES MUST BE PLACED ON THE GENERAL PURPOSE NCS ANSWER SHEET. All answers will be confidential, so please do not put the student's name on the form. Additionally, no campus or district specific identifiers are used. Only general demographic codes are entered so that the data may be appropriately analyzed. No teacher, campus, or district can be identified for **any** purpose. When you have completed the questionnaire for each student, please return only the NCS answer sheets. DO NOT FOLD OR STAPLE THE ANSWER SHEETS IN ANY WAY.

BE SURE TO USE A NUMBER TWO PENCIL

START WITH SIDE TWO for _____ .
(Student Name - local use only)

FILL IN THE CIRCLES THAT CORRESPOND TO THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

A. DO NOT ENTER ANY NAME INFORMATION.

B. Darken the circle that corresponds to the student's sex.

C. Under the heading "BIRTH DATE" darken the year and month that corresponds to the student's birth date. For example, a student born in March 1979 would be coded 7903.

D. Under the heading "SPECIAL CODES" enter "1" in the **first column.**

The **second column** will either be entered as "1"-success or a "2"-nonsuccess depending on the student selected. The district contact person has the instructions on selecting students and will provide you with this information.

The **third column** will either be entered as a "1"-district defined, "2"-after program, or a "3"-TEAMS defined success in district. Again, the district contact will provide this information.

There should be a 3 digit code for each student under the heading "SPECIAL CODES." Do **not** use columns 4, 5, and 6.

E. Under the heading "IDENTIFICATION NUMBER," enter the special demographic code for your district. Start on the left side of the box. This number is also available from your district contact person.

F. Under the heading "GRADE OR EDUCATION" darken the number that corresponds to the student's current grade level.

TURN TO SIDE ONE OF THE ANSWER SHEET

DARKEN THE APPROPRIATE CIRCLE FOR QUESTIONS 1-77

IF INFORMATION IS UNAVAILABLE OR NOT APPLICABLE—LEAVE BLANK
DO NOT DARKEN MORE THAN ONE CIRCLE FOR ANY QUESTION

UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED, QUESTIONS REFER TO AND INCLUDE SCHOOL YEAR 1986-87

Student Specific

1. In school year 1986-87, this student was enrolled in a program that is classified as:

   A. Bilingual
   B. English as a second language

2. Was this student in another compensatory/remedial program in 1986-87 (for example Chapter 1)?

   A. Yes
   B. No

3. How many years has this student been in the district?

   A. Less than 1 year (enrolled this year after January 1987)
   B. 1 year (enrolled this year before January 1987)
   C. 2-3 years
   D. 4-5 years
   E. 6 or more years

4. If the student is an immigrant, did the student receive schooling in the native country?

   A. Yes
   B. No
   C. Unknown

5. How many different schools (campuses or districts) has this student attended in the last five years? Do not consider normal grade progression from one campus to another as a change in schools, i.e., junior high to high school.

   A. 1 school
   B. 2 schools
   C. 3-5 schools
   D. 6-7 schools
   E. 8-10 schools

6. Has this student been classified as migrant in the last five years?

   A. Yes
   B. No

7. Has the student been eligible for free/reduced price lunch in the last five years?

   A. Yes
   B. No

8. How many times has this student been retained during his academic career?

   A. 0 times
   B. 1 time
   C. 2 times
   D. 3 times
   E. 4 or more times

9. How many years has this student participated in special language program(s) (e.g., bilingual, ESL, etc.)?

   A. 1 year or less
   B. 2 years
   C. 3 years
   D. 4 years
   E. 5 or more years

10. If applicable, how many times has this student reentered a special language program (e.g., bilingual, ESL, etc.) after leaving the program?

    A. Not Applicable
    B. 1 time
    C. 2 times
    D. 3 times
    E. 4 or more times

11. If the student has exited or is to be exited, what category best represents this student's LEP status when exiting the bilingual/ESL program?

    A. Student scored between the 23rd and 40th percentile (%ile) on both the reading and language arts subtests of a standardized English achievement test and the Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) determined exiting of the bilingual/ESL program.

    B. Student scored at or above the 40th percentile on both the reading and language arts subtests of a standardized English achievement test.

    C. Withdrew from the bilingual/ESL program due to parents request.

    D. Student scored below the 23rd percentile but mastered the essential elements in English.

    E. Student demonstrated proficiency in the areas of listening, speaking, reading and writing of the English language and met the district's promotion standards applicable to English proficient students. (Referring only to students in grade 1.)

12. What was this student's LEP status (or most closely resembles) when he/she was first placed in the bilingual/ESL program (see definitions, categories refer to those found in the Time and Treatment Guidelines)? (Please darken one of the following categories in **either,** but not both, questions 12 or 13.)

    A. BE1
    B. BE2
    C. BE3
    D. BE4
    E. BE5

13. Continuation of categories from question 12.

    A. BE6
    B. ESL1
    C. ESL2
    D. ESL3
    E. ESL4

14. Was any other language assessment procedure used in addition to a state approved oral language proficiency test?

    A. Yes
    B. No

15. Was a formal assessment of the student's individual learning style made?

    A. Yes
    B. No

16. At the **beginning** of the 1986-87 year, the student used his native language approximately what percent of the time in a **classroom** setting?

    A. Greater than 80%
    B. 60-79%
    C. 40-59%
    D. 20-39%
    E. Less than 20%

17. At the **end** of the 1986-87 year, the student used his native language approximately what percent of the time in a **classroom** setting?

    A. Greater than 80%
    B. 60-79%
    C. 40-59%
    D. 20-39%
    E. Less than 20%

18. At the **beginning** of the 1986-87 year, the student used his native language approximately what percent of the time in a **non-classroom** setting?

    A. Greater than 80%
    B. 60-79%
    C. 40-59%
    D. 20-39%
    E. Less than 20%

19. At the **end** of the 1986-87 year, the student used his native language approximately what percent of the time in a **non-classroom** setting?

    A. Greater than 80%
    B. 60-79%
    C. 40-59%
    D. 20-39%
    E. Less than 20%

20. Has there been an increase in English oral language proficiency as measured by:

    A. Objectively (oral language proficiency test scores)
    B. Subjectively (teacher judgement)
    C. Both A and B
    D. Neither A nor B

21. If this student's native language is Spanish and your school district administered a Spanish Achievement test in **1986-87,** in what percentile range did this student score for the Total Reading (or equivalent) subtest?

    A. Greater than the 80%ile
    B. 60%ile - 79%ile
    C. 40%ile - 59%ile
    D. 20%ile - 39%ile
    E. Less than 20%ile

22. If your school district administered an English Achievement test in **1986-87,** what percentile range did this student score for the Total Reading (or equivalent) subtest?

    A. Greater than the 80%ile
    B. 60%ile - 79%ile
    C. 40%ile - 59%ile
    D. 20%ile - 39%ile
    E. Less than the 20%ile

23. If your school district administered an English Achievement test in **1985-86,** in what percentile range did this student score for the Total Reading (or equivalent) subtest?

    A. Greater than the 80%ile
    B. 60%ile - 79%ile
    C. 40%ile - 59%ile
    D. 20%ile - 39%ile
    E. Less than the 20%ile

24. Has this student ever been exempt from taking the English TEAMS test?

A. Yes
B. No

25. Are the answers given in questions 24-26 from a Spanish or English version of the TEAMS?

A. English
B. Spanish

26. Please report the percentage of objectives passed for the 1987 TEAMS Reading subtest.

A. Greater than 80%
B. 60-79%
C. 40-59%
D. 20-39%
E. Less than 20%

27. Please report the percentage of objectives passed for the 1987 TEAMS Writing subtest.

A. Greater than 80%
B. 60-79%
C. 40-59%
D. 20-39%
E. Less than 20%

28. Please report the percentage of objectives passed for the 1987 TEAMS Mathematics subtest.

A. Greater than 80%
B. 60-79%
C. 40-59%
D. 20-39%
E. Less than 20%

29. Please report the percentage of objectives passed for the 1985 Texas Assessment of Basic Skills Reading subtest.

A. Greater than 80%
B. 60-79%
C. 40-59%
D. 20-39%
E. Less than 20%

30. Please report the percentage of objectives passed for the 1985 Texas Assessment of Basic Skills Writing subtest.

A. Greater than 80%
B. 60-79%
C. 40-59%
D. 20-39%
E. Less than 20%

31. Please report the percentage of objectives passed for the 1985 Texas Assessment of Basic Skills Mathematics subtest.

A. Greater than 80%
B. 60-79%
C. 40-59%
D. 20-39%
E. Less than 20%

32. Is this student considered on grade level, below grade level, or above grade level in English reading?

A. On grade level
B. Below grade level
C. Above grade level

33. Has the student mastered the district's **Language Arts** essential elements on grade level?

A. Yes
B. No

34. Has the student mastered the district's **Mathematics** essential elements on grade level?

A. Yes
B. No

35. Has the student mastered the district's **Science** essential elements on grade level?

A. Yes
B. No

36. Has the student mastered the district's **Social Studies** essential elements on grade level?

A. Yes
B. No

37. For school year 1987-88 is the student scheduled to be:

A. Promoted
B. Retained
C. Placed (alternative to social promotion)

38. Has this student ever received services in a gifted/talented program?

A. Yes
B. No

39. Is this student utilized by his teacher to tutor other students in his/her classroom?

A. Yes
B. No

40. For the 1986-87 school year, what was the number of days this student missed (excused and unexcused)?

A. 0 days
B. 1-5 days
C. 6-10 days
D. 11-20 days
E. 21 or more days

41. Does this student's file contain any indication of serious behavior problems?

A. Yes
B. No

42. How likely do you think it is that this student will drop out of school without continued support from some form of remedial/compensatory program **throughout** school?

A. Very unlikely to need continued help
B. Help only needed for 1-2 more years
C. Only occasional tutorial or other help
D. Will need significant intervention
E. Will drop out in any case

43. How many organized extracurricular activities does this student participate in during the 1986-87 school year?

A. 0 activities
B. 1 activity
C. 2 activities
D. 3 activities
E. 4 or more activities

44. How much out-of-classroom interaction does the student have with **monolingual English** speakers?

A. None
B. Seldom
C. Moderate
D. Often
E. Extensive

45. How much out-of-classroom interaction does the student have with other students **monolingual in the student's native language?**

A. None
B. Seldom
C. Moderate
D. Often
E. Extensive

46. How much out-of-classroom interaction does the student have with students **bilingual in the student's native language?**

A. None
B. Seldom
C. Moderate
D. Often
E. Extensive

Program

47. How many regular English-only academic classes (periods, subjects) does the student attend each day (also see the next two questions)?

A. 1 class
B. 2 classes
C. 3 classes
D. 4 classes
E. 5 or more classes

48. How many English-only, but reduced or modified content academic classes (periods, subjects) does the student attend each day?

A. 1 class
B. 2 classes
C. 3 classes
D. 4 classes
E. 5 or more classes

49. How many classes (periods, subjects) does the student attend each day where the student's native language is used?

A. 1 class
B. 2 classes
C. 3 classes
D. 4 classes
E. 5 or more classes

50. Of these classes in question 49, **generally** speaking, what percent of the time is the student's native language used (use end of year if this changes over the year)?

A. Greater than 80%
B. 60-79%
C. 40-59%
D. 20-39%
E. Less than 20%

51. At the **beginning** of the 1986-87 school year, the special language teacher used the student's native language **with this student** what percent of the time?

A. Greater than 80%
B. 60-79%
C. 40-59%
D. 20-39%
E. Less than 20%

52. At the **end** of the 1986-87 school year, the special language teacher used the student's native language **with this student** what percent of the time?

A. Greater than 80%
B. 60-79%
C. 40-59%
D. 20-39%
E. Less than 20%

53. Is the native language used:

A. More in Language Arts Instruction than in content areas
B. Less in Language Arts Instruction than in content areas
C. About the same in both

54. On average, how large are the student's classes for special language instruction?

A. Less than 10 students
B. 11-18 students
C. 19-22 students
D. 23-30 students
E. Greater than 30 students

55. On average, how large are the student's classes for English-only classes?

A. Less than 10 students
B. 11-18 students
C. 19-22 students
D. 23-30 students
E. Greater than 30 students

For questions 56-66 respond for the student's special language classes and for English-only classes. If the student has no English-only classes, simply ignore the English-only responses, but please complete the questions.

THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM FOR THIS CHILD INCLUDES:

56. All essential elements covered at same depth as for regular students.

    A. Special language only class
    B. English-only class
    C. Both A and B
    D. Neither A nor B

57. All essential elements covered in less depth as for regular students.

    A. Special language only class
    B. English-only class
    C. Both A and B
    D. Neither A nor B

58. Fewer essential elements covered than for regular students.

    A. Special language only class
    B. English-only class
    C. Both A and B
    D. Neither A nor B

59. Mastery learning.

    A. Special language only class
    B. English-only class
    C. Both A and B
    D. Neither A nor B

60. Test taking skills.

    A. Special language only class
    B. English-only class
    C. Both A and B
    D. Neither A nor B

61. Additional time on task.

    A. Special language only class
    B. English-only class
    C. Both A and B
    D. Neither A nor B

62. Computerized instruction.

    A. Special language only class
    B. English-only class
    C. Both A and B
    D. Neither A nor B

63. Tutoring within the school day.

A. Special language only class
B. English-only class
C. Both A and B
D. Neither A nor B

64. Tutoring before/after the school day.

A. Special language only class
B. English-only class
C. Both A and B
D. Neither A nor B

65. Grouping by language group.

A. Special language only class
B. English-only class
C. Both A and B
D. Neither A nor B

66. Grouping by ability.

A. Special language only class
B. English-only class
C. Both A and B
D. Neither A nor B

Teachers

67. Is a teacher aide used in a special language classroom?

A. Yes, one with the child's native language skills
B. Yes, but one without the child's native language skills
C. No

68. Is a teacher aide used in an English-only classroom?

A. Yes, one with the child's native language skills
B. Yes, but one without the child's native language skills
C. No

69. How often would you say the coordination (meetings, conferences, overall instructional objectives) between the special language and regular program teacher occur? (Do not answer if the teacher for the special language program and regular program is the same.)

A. Non-existent
B. Rarely
C. Monthly
D. Weekly
E. Daily

70. How many overall years of teaching does the student's special language teacher have (including 1986-87)?

A. 1 year
B. 2-3 years
C. 4-5 years
D. 6-10 years
E. 11 or more years

71. How many years of teaching experience in a bilingual/ESL program does this student's current teacher have (including 1986-87)?

A. 1 year
B. 2-3 years
C. 4-5 years
D. 6-10 years
E. 11 or more years

72. Credentials to teach this student's special language program were obtained by an:

A. Endorsement/Certification obtained at the time a teaching certificate was received from college
B. Endorsement/Certification obtained after a teaching certificate was received from college
C. Temporary Permit (e.g., emergency permit, special assignment permit)
D. Prior Service (e.g., grandfathered)

73. If applicable, how many college hours of Spanish language courses has this student's teacher earned?

A. Not applicable
B. 3-6 hours
C. 7-9 hours
D. 10-12 hours
E. 13 or more hours

Parents

74. Does the student's parent(s) (guardian) participate in PTA/PTO organizations?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Don't know

75. Does the student's parent(s) (guardian) participate in classroom activities (non-parent aides, etc.)?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Don't know

76. How many conferences (visits, telephone, etc.) have you had with the parent(s) (guardian) during 1986-87 school year?

A. 1 conference
B. 2-3 conferences
C. 4-5 conferences
D. 6-7 conferences
E. 8-10 conferences

77. Does the student's parent(s) (guardian) participate in Adult Education classwork (such as an English language class)?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Don't know

Definitions for Compensatory Education and Bilingual/ESL Reports

Additional Time on Task. Providing students additional direct instructional time focused on learning specific skills and concepts to meet an instructional objective.

Aide in Same Class (full-day). Classroom setting which uses a teacher aide in the same class for the total school day to assist with instruction.

Alternative Education Programs. School programs to serve special student populations, defined as students who are not able to function in the structure of a regular school setting, are potential dropouts, or have discipline problems. Alternative programs may be located within a school or on a separate campus; operate before, during, or after school hours; modify clock hour requirements for courses; modify the number of units a student takes; and modify methods of instruction, pacing, and materials.

Basic Skills Instruction (full-day). Alternative instructional programs for students who may not be successful in the traditional program at the next grade level. Instruction focuses on reading, writing, and mathematics skills and concepts for the entire school day. Social studies, science, health, and other content materials are used to teach, remediate, and strengthen basic skills and concepts. This is one alternative education program model.

Bilingual (full-day). A full-time program of dual-language instruction that provides for learning basic skills in the primary language of limited English proficient students and that also provides for carefully structured and sequenced mastery of English language skills. These required programs include six components addressing language arts, math, science, and social studies in two languages in such a manner as to instill in the student confidence, self-assurance, and a positive identity with his or her cultural heritage.

Bilingual Education Program. A program of dual-language instruction that provides for learning basic skills in the primary language of LEP students and also for mastery of English language skills.

Compensatory Classes. Instruction provided to students performing below a standard set by the district or state as satisfactory in academic courses. Classes may include Correlated Language Arts, Reading Improvement (7th and 8th grade), Fundamentals of Mathematics, Consumer Mathematics, Pre-Algebra, Informal Geometry, and other basic skills instruction (i.e., Chapter 1, SCE). Sources of funding may include federal, state, or local.

Compensatory Education. Instruction provided to educationally or economically disadvantaged students who are performing below a standard set by the district or state on standardized achievement tests, in academic courses, or on basic skills assessment instruments (e.g., TEAMS). The instruction may be primary or supplemental.

Computer-Oriented Instruction (in classroom). Basic skills instruction provided by a certified teacher and reinforced through the use of computer-based instruction in the classroom.

Correlated Language Arts I-IV (CLA). A sequence of courses in English designed for students who are generally limited in language arts abilities and who cannot demonstrate skills that promise success in the regular English sequence. Placement into CLA is made according to district policy.

Departmentalized. Instruction provided by subject area. Students are taught by content area teachers.

Direct Compensatory Instructional Service. Instruction that is delivered to students performing below set standards by a teacher, aide, tutor, in a computer lab, or in a formal classroom on a regularly scheduled basis. As defined, this includes only tutorials that a student is **required** to attend. This concept implies that there is direct interaction between an adult and the student.

Drill and Practice. Activities that are repetitive and provide opportunities for students to practice the skill or concept that has been taught. Drill and practice activities may be conducted by certified teachers, teacher aides, tutors, or through computer-based instruction.

English as a Second Language (ESL). Programs which use second language learning and teaching methodologies in the teaching of English to students whose first language is other than English.

ESL for Content Instruction. Utilization of second language methods in the teaching of subject matter other than language arts.

ESL for Language Arts Instruction. Utilization of second language learning/teaching methodology in the teaching of English language arts skills and concepts.

Extended Day—During Regular School Year. Extended day instruction may occur before or after the regular school day or on Saturday or other days when the regular school program is not in operation.

Extended School Year—Summer School. Instruction that is provided between the end of the last day of the regular school term and before the first day of instruction in the fall. Its purpose is usually to teach and remediate skills or concepts that students did not master during the regular school year.

Grouping Heterogeneously. Each classroom is composed of students who are functioning at various levels of academic achievement. Ability levels of the students vary.

Grouping Heterogeneously for Language Arts. Each classroom is composed of students who are functioning at various levels of academic achievement in the students' primary language or English for listening, speaking, reading, writing, or language concepts or skills. Ability levels of the students vary.

Grouping Homogeneously. Each classroom is composed of students who are functioning at similar levels of achievement in a subject area. Ability levels of the students are similar.

Grouping Homogeneously for Language Arts. Each classroom is composed of students who are functioning at similar levels of achievement in the students' primary language or English for listening, speaking, reading, writing, or language concepts or skills. Ability levels of the students are similar.

Instructional Approaches. Refers to how instruction is delivered to impart information, i.e., teaching methodologies, strategies, and techniques.

Instructional Arrangements. Refers to the physical delivery system in terms of how students are placed in classrooms and grouped for instruction (e.g., send-in, pull-out, lab setting, tutorials, etc).

Lab Setting With Computers. Students are pulled from their regular class for instruction and/or reinforcement of skills or concepts introduced in the classroom. This instruction is delivered through the use of computers.

Lab Setting Without Computers. Students are pulled from their regular class for instruction and/or reinforcement of skills or concepts. Instruction is delivered by teacher or aide.

Limited English Proficient (LEP). Students of limited English proficiency are those students having a language other than English in the home and who have difficulty progressing in all English instructional settings.

Mastery Learning. Requires that each student master a skill or task before proceeding to the next one.

Peer or Cross-Age Tutoring. Under the supervision of a teacher, students help one or more students master a skill or concept.

Placed. The student is placed into the next grade level as an alternative to being retained.

Primary Language for Clarification. Utilization of the student's primary language to help clarify language concept skills that a student has difficulty understanding.

Primary Language for Content Instruction. Utilization of a student's primary language as a medium for instruction in mathematics, science, or social studies.

Primary Language for Language Arts Instruction. The second component in required bilingual education programs designed to provide instruction in comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing in the student's primary language.

Promoted. The student has met all required criteria and is advanced to the next grade level.

Reading Improvement. A year long course designed for students in grades seven and eight. It is mandatory for students who score below the 40th percentile or who are one year or more below grade equivalence on a standardized achievement test. LEP students are provided one period of ESL and may also take reading improvement.

Reduced Instructor to Student Ratio. The ratio of instructors to students is lower than the average size of a regular class on a given campus.

Resource Arrangement (pull-out). An instructional setting in which students leave their classroom and move to another setting where a teacher or aide provides instruction in the appropriate area.

Retained. The student remains in the same grade level for a second year.

Self-Contained. A classroom setting in which students are taught all subjects by the same teacher.

Self-Paced Instruction, Continuous Progress, or Individualized Progress. Students progress at a rate commensurate with their achievement or abilities.

Send-In. A teacher or aide enters the regular classroom to provide special instructional services to one or more students who have a designated need for special help.

Study Skills. Instruction is provided to students on appropriate ways to approach the acquisition of content or skills.

Team-Teaching. A teacher shares responsibility for the instruction of a set of students, usually in two or three classrooms.

Test-Taking Skills. Instruction intended to expose students to test formats and strategies to maximize performance on tests.

Transition Programs for Primary Grades. Alternative instructional programs for students who may not be successful in the traditional program at the next grade level. It implies the use of alternative teaching strategies, curricular materials, and possibly pacing.

Tutorial Instruction. Remedial instruction in which students receive help in addition to the regular instructional time in academic areas that need strengthening.

Tutorial Programs Before or After School. Tutorial instruction is provided outside of the regular school day.

Tutorial Programs During School Day. Tutorial programs which are conducted during the school day but at times or periods when regular instruction is not being conducted, such as advisory periods, study halls, or other unscheduled time.

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN RULE AND STATUTE

This appendix contains references to portions of the Texas Education Code and the Texas Administrative Code regarding special language program evaluation.

General Provisions

Texas Education Code §11.63(a)(3)

(a) The State Department of Education shall

(3) seek to assist local school districts in developing effective and improved programs of education through research and experimentation, consultation, conferences, and evaluation...

Specific Provisions

Texas Education Code §21.258(c)

(c) A report under this section must also include information about the number of students in each classroom, excluding instrumental and choral music classrooms, per class period. The report must specify, by grade, the number of classrooms, excluding instrumental and choral music classrooms, in which in any class period the number of students exceeds:

(1) for kindergarten through 8th grade, 20;

(2) for high school, 25; and

(3) for special education, 10.

Title 19, Texas Administrative Code §77.366

All districts required to conduct a bilingual education or English as a second language program shall conduct periodic assessment and continuous diagnosis in the language of instruction for the purpose of completing an annual performance report. Districts shall report such information in a form required by the commissioner of education.

APPENDIX D

COMPARISON OF STUDIES

The purpose of this appendix is to highlight differences between the Phase II 1986-87 Bilingual/English as a Second Language (ESL) Evaluation conducted by the Texas Education Agency (Agency) and the 1986 Longitudinal Study of Immersion Programs for Language-Minority Children conducted by SRA Technologies (first year report of a five year project).

The primary task of the SRA study was to compare the relative effectiveness of a structured English immersion program, a late-exit transitional bilingual program, and an early-exit transitional bilingual program. The Agency study was designed to collect performance data on limited English proficient (LEP) students served in either a bilingual program or an ESL program as well as to link performance data to program implementation.

A major difference in the design of these two evaluations is the selection of the study sample. SRA conducted telephone and personal interviews with teachers, school administrators, and project directors and included classroom observations to determine what sites met selection criteria. Nine sites participated in the SRA study - six from Texas, two from California, and one from Florida. Data was collected by personnel hired to conduct interviews and supervise testing. By contrast, the Agency disseminated data collection instruments to all school districts in Texas with a bilingual and/or ESL program. Campus level information was requested, either on a long or a short version of a data collection instrument, depending on district size. In addition, student level information was completed for LEP students identified either as successful or non-successful. These students were "randomly" selected by the district and met certain specified criteria.

Another noted difference between evaluation designs involves the grade levels from which data was collected. SRA obtained data for kindergarten, first, and third grade students only. These grade levels were chosen partly because this longitudinal study requires follow-up documentation on targeted students and these grade level cohorts are the most appropriate to document. Kindergarten LEP students were represented in all three programs, first grade data was collected for students in immersion and early-exit programs, and third grade data from late-exit programs. The Agency requested data for LEP students in both bilingual and ESL programs that included all grade levels (prekindergarten through twelfth grade).

Both SRA and the Agency reported on instructional methodologies but stressed very different concepts. SRA reported on types of explanations teachers gave to students (e.g. explanations dealing with procedures, concepts, labels, and rules) and the type of questions teachers ask (e.g. display, referential, clarification, etc.). SRA also examined the type of feedback teachers gave to students (e.g. confirmation, corrective explicit, positive evaluation, etc.) and the types of corrections teachers made to students (e.g. pronunciation, grammar, and concepts). The Agency focused on instructional methodologies such as mastery learning, computerized drill and practice, peer tutor, tutorial, self-contained, and team-teaching.

Another difference between the studies involves the information obtained on classroom staff. SRA conducted an intensive examination of classroom staff (teachers and classroom aides). Background information such as demographics, education and training, classroom program, and attitudes toward second language learners were reported for teachers in the SRA study. SRA also examined instructional materials used, understanding of program goals and procedures, frequency of homework assignments, and the philosophy of education of the teachers. Information on classroom aides included characteristics, qualifications, and opinions about instructing LEP students. The Agency requested information on experience and credentials of teachers, the availability of classroom aides, and use of the child's native language for instruction.

In depth interviews with project administrators, site administrators (principals), and district administrators were conducted for the SRA study. SRA obtained background characteristics, attitudes toward educational services to language-minority children, and program goals from interviews.

SRA reported on district demographics, as did the Agency, but also included community characteristics from areas where programs are implemented.

Another difference between evaluation designs is noted in the information reported on parental involvement and family background. The Agency obtained data on parental participation in PTA/PTO organizations and parental participation in classrooms. SRA reported on student's family size, parent's residency, age, and income. Also, the extent that targeted children are exposed to English and/or Spanish in the home and community. SRA examined the type and the primary language of written material available in the student's household as well as the availability of radio and television and the primary language of this type of media exposure.

SRA collected data on preschool experience of targeted students. If the student had attended preschool, the primary language spoken in preschool was reported (English, Spanish, or both). The Agency study examined the percentage of the time that the student used the native language both within and outside of the classroom.

SRA and the Agency both obtained test data from standardized English and Spanish achievement tests as well as from oral language proficiency tests. The Agency reported additional information in that data regarding mastery of essential elements, promotion/retention, reading grade level, TEAMS, need for remediation, program exit, and extracurricular activities was also collected.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

TITLE VI, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964; THE MODIFIED COURT ORDER, CIVIL ACTION 5281, FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, TYLER DIVISION

Reviews of local education agencies pertaining to compliance with Title VI Civil Rights Act of 1964 and with specific requirements of the Modified Court Order, Civil Action No. 5281, Federal District Court, Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division are conducted periodically by staff representatives of the Texas Education Agency. These reviews cover at least the following policies and practices:

(1) acceptance policies on student transfers from other school districts;

(2) operation of school bus routes or runs on a non-segregated basis;

(3) nondiscrimination in extracurricular activities and the use of school facilities;

(4) nondiscriminatory practices in the hiring, assigning, promoting, paying, demoting, reassigning, or dismissing of faculty and staff members who work with children;

(5) enrollment and assignment of students without discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin;

(6) nondiscriminatory practices relating to the use of a student's first language; and

(7) evidence of published procedures for hearing complaints and grievances.

In addition to conducting reviews, the Texas Education Agency staff representatives check complaints of discrimination made by a citizen or citizens residing in a school district where it is alleged discriminatory practices have occurred or are occurring.

Where a violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act is found, the findings are reported to the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education.

If there is a direct violation of the Court Order in Civil Action No. 5281 that cannot be cleared through negotiation, the sanctions required by the Court Order are applied.

TITLE VII, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964; EXECUTIVE ORDERS 11246 AND 11375; TITLE IX, 1973 EDUCATION AMENDMENTS; REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973 AS AMENDED; 1974 AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGE-HOUR LAW EXPANDING THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967; AND VIETNAM ERA VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972 AS AMENDED IN 1974.

It is the policy of the Texas Education Agency to comply fully with the nondiscrimination provisions of all federal and state laws and regulations by assuring that no person shall be excluded from consideration for recruitment, selection, appointment, training, promotion, retention, or any other personnel action, or be denied any benefits or participation in any programs or activities which it operates on the grounds of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, handicap, age, or veteran status (except where age, sex, or handicap constitute a bona fide occupational qualification necessary to proper and efficient administration). The Texas Education Agency makes positive efforts to employ and advance in employment all protected groups.

Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701

RE9-726-03

September 1988